UNION ACADÉMIQUE INTERNATIONALE

MONUMENTA MUSICAE BYZANTINAE

A CARSTEN HØEG CONDITA

IX

TRIODIUM ATHOUM

EDENDUM CURAVERUNT

ENRICA FOLLIERI et OLIVER STRUNK

Pars Suppletoria

HAUNIAE

MUNKSGAARD

1975

UNION ACADÉMIQUE INTERNATIONALE

MONUMENTA
MUSICAE BYZANTINAE

A CARSTEN HØEG CONDITA

EDIDERUNT

ENRICA FOLLIERI · HENRIK GLAHN · KENNETH LEVY
JØRGEN RAASTED · OLIVER STRUNK · EGON WELLESZ
GÜNTHER ZUNTZ
UNA CUM ARCHIMANDRITA CRYPTENSI

IX

TRIODIUM
ATHOUM

HAUNIAE

MUNKSGAARD
1975

TRIODIUM ATHOUM

EDENDUM CURAVERUNT
ENRICA FOLLIERI et OLIVER STRUNK

Codex Monasterii Vatopedii 1488
phototypice depictus

Pars Suppletoria

HAUNIAE

MUNKSGAARD
1975

Published with the aid of subsidies from the American Council of Learned Societies
and the American Musicological Society

COMPOSITION AND PRINTING:
FR. BAGGES KGL. HOFBOGTRYKKERI
COPENHAGEN

PLATES PRINTED BY:
SVEND ANTON JENSEN OFFSET
COPENHAGEN

α. Ρααιτεγα
43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

When a publication is presented as the result of a collaboration, the reader naturally wishes to know how the work has been divided. The writing of this preface devolves upon me as senior partner, and I shall begin by answering the question at once. Miss Follieri has contributed the physical description of the manuscript, has edited the texts of Appendices B and C, and has prepared the analytical index and the index of first lines; I myself am responsible for the rest and for the translation of the physical description. But the work has been a genuine collaboration, not a mechanical division of labor, and there can scarcely be a page of mine that is not at least to some extent a joint effort. I am more than grateful to Miss Follieri for all that she has done for this publication—and by no means least for her inspired solution of the problem posed by the erasure on folio 108 verso (Appendix A, No. 64). For me our collaboration has been a memorable experience and an immensely rewarding one. The Triodion Vatopedi 1488 is a many-sided entity with innumerable ramifications; to deal with it adequately calls for philological and codicological acumen as well as musicological, and if in what is said about its liturgical peculiarities the reader discovers a certain lack of sophistication, the fault is wholly mine.

Almost twenty years have passed since I published my first account of Vatopedi 1488 in the *Annales musicologiques*. In the meantime I have learned a good deal about the manuscript that I did not know in 1955, but I cannot find in that first account much to apologize for. The "stichera by Cosmas for which we have no other source" have proved to be stanzas from well-known canons and triodia of his for Holy Week, but in compensation we have, attributed to him, three hitherto unknown stichera for Pentecost. The set of antiphons for the Mandatum can no longer be called "unique", and the apocryphal part of the manuscript's contents constitutes rather less than the 40 per cent originally estimated. But these

little inaccuracies do not affect the rest of the study or invalidate any of its conclusions.

Publication of this edition was decided upon as long ago as August 1958 at a Board meeting in Copenhagen, and during the summers of 1959 and 1960 I drew up a general plan for the Pars suppletoria and prepared a list of the apocrypha with their concordances substantially identical with the one now printed as Appendix A. But in 1961, when I took over the direction of the Monumenta after the death of Carsten Høeg, I concluded that the facsimile of the Heirmologion Saba 83 ought to take precedence—it was a project liberally supported by the Carlsberg Foundation and initiated by Høeg himself. Thus it was not until 1968, when the first volume of the Saba facsimile was issued, that I took up my own project again, and it was at about this time, too, that Miss Follieri became associated with it. Publication was planned for early 1971, and in 1970 and 1971 I obtained generous grants from the American Council of Learned Societies and from the American Musicological Society with a view to reducing the selling price. To my regret and considerable embarrassment, however, circumstances beyond my control made it absolutely impossible for me to hold to this schedule, with the result that rapidly mounting manufacturing costs have by this time largely wiped out the benefits to the subscribers that the two grants had been expected to yield.

The dating of manuscripts on palaeographic grounds is far from being an exact science, and the reader ought not to be surprised on finding in the course of what follows some difference of opinion. My own date for Vatopedi 1488, admittedly intuitive, has been "about 1050"; Professor Floros, who has explained in some detail the reasons for his view, prefers a date later in the century; Miss Follieri, on the other hand, largely on the basis of the manuscript's affinities with another one from Vatopedi dated 1021/22, now in Moscow, assigns Vatopedi 1488 to the first half of the century and even inclines towards its first thirty years. I shall not attempt to adjudicate this controversy, if such it may be called. But I shall urge that Miss Follieri's reasoning be given the most careful consideration. That branch of Greek palaeography that concerns itself with the notations of Byzantine chant is much younger than its parent discipline, which takes all Byzantine manuscripts as its province; it deals with a much smaller body of evidence; its earliest

dated source belongs to the year 1106, whereas the parent discipline disposes of dated sources as early as 800 for the majuscule script, as 835 for the minuscule. And while the presence, in a single manuscript, of a musical notation more archaic than its text hand is easily understood, the opposite situation would be almost incomprehensibile unless in a manuscript whose musical notation had been added years after the text itself was copied.

It remains for me to clarify the relation of the present edition to Professor Constantin Floros's *Universale Neumenkunde* (1970), a three-volume publication which owes rather more to the Monumenta and to me personally than its author has cared to acknowledge. This cuts across the contents of my share of the Pars suppletoria in that it contains a list of the Chartres apocrypha found in Vatopedi 1488 with their concordances, similar in many respects to my Appendix A. Much as I dislike duplication, I have concluded that I ought not to suppress my own solution of the problem, more complete than the one published by Professor Floros and more clearly arranged; the concordances I have listed for the Palaeoslavonic Triodion Chilandari 307 owe nothing to Professor Floros, being based on identifications made some years ago by Arne Bugge, shortly to be published in a volume being edited for the Monumenta by Dr. Christian Hannick. At the same time, the publication by Professor Floros has provided me with a useful check on my own work, and it would be most discourteous of me if I were not to acknowledge the specific bits of information for which I am indebted to him. From his main text I have taken over the references to the marginal notes on folio 36 verso of Laura Γ. 67 and on folio 59 verso of Laura Γ. 72, and from his Table VII I have taken over four concordances—those for Apocryphon 15 with Patmos 218, for Apocryphon 36 with Vienna, theol. gr. 136, and for Apocrypha 73 and 77 with Ochrida 53.

Since this may very well be the last publication of mine to be issued by the house of Munksgaard, I shall record here my lively appreciation of the unfailing cordiality and innumerable kindnesses of Mr. Oluf V. Møller, the director of the firm, and of the patience, the helpfulness, and the wise counsel of his extremely efficient assistant, Mr. P. Pettersson.

Oliver Strunk.

Rome, September 5, 1974

Not until this Pars Suppletoria was already in an advanced state of proof did I learn of the death of Professor Egon Wellesz in Oxford on November 9, 1974. The first to recognize and state the case for the study of Byzantine chant as a field of music historical research, the one musicologist among the original members of the Monumenta's board of editors, Wellesz was in the strictest sense of the word a founder. He will be sorely missed.

Oliver Strunk

INTRODUCTION

Among our earlier Byzantine choir-books, the Triodion Vatopedi 1488 is in many respects the most remarkable. It has been completely preserved, its parchment is still relatively clean, its ink unfaded, and if it were not for the ruthless trimming to which its folios were subjected when they were rebound some years ago, it might be called a perfect specimen. For the student of Byzantine hymnography it holds a special interest, adding as it does to the established contents of a book of its kind an impressive number of texts seldom encountered, most of them to be found also in the fragmentary Triodia at the Laura (1), whose original state it can help him to reconstruct. For the student of the earlier Byzantine musical notations it is an ideal document, seeing that in entering the melodies its scribe has used two distinct semeiographic systems, the Coislin and the Chartres, the one for the melodies of the established contents and for a few of the additions, the other for the remaining melodies and for the concluding section of the book in its entirety.

The manuscript was first described in 1924 by Sophronios Eustratiades and Arcadios in their catalogue of the library at the Vatopedi monastery (2) and was then briefly referred to by Father Lorenzo Tardo in his *L'Antica melurgia bizantina* (1938) and in the introduction to his *L'Ottoeco nei mss. melurgici* (1955) (3). Since May 1953, when the microfilm on which the present edition is based was made at my suggestion for the Library of Congress by Professor

(1) Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72; for these manuscripts and for the Triodion Laura Γ. 12, see pages 30 and 43 below, notes 5 and 8.

(2) *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos* (Cambridge, 1924), p. 234.

(3) This introduction was first published separately in the *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, I (1947).

Ernest W. Saunders of the Garrett Biblical Institute, I myself have studied the manuscript repeatedly (4). It has also served Jørgen Raasted, in his *Intonation Formulas and Modal Signatures in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts* (1966), as one of his principal witnesses, and still more recently it has been restudied in some detail by Constantin Floros in his *Universale Neumenkunde* (1970).

Eustratiades and Father Lorenzo assigned the manuscript without further qualification to the eleventh century. My own date for it has been "about 1050." Floros has preferred to place it somewhat later, in the second half of the eleventh century (5). In any case it is in Vatopedi 1488 that we encounter for the first time the designation "Sticherarion." Its full title reads: Στιχεράριν τῆς ἁγίας τεσσαρακοστῆς ἀρχόμενον μὲν ἀπὸ τῇ κυριακῇ τοῦ φαρισσαίου μέχρι τῶν ἁγίων πάντων—"The Sticherarion for Lent, from the Sunday of the Pharisee to All Saints" (6). Such a book, containing only the stichera for the movable feasts, is more usually called a "Triodion," the designation "Sticherarion" being as a rule reserved for books containing the stichera for the fixed feasts or for those containing the entire repertory.

(4) First and foremost in "The Notation of the Chartres Fragment", *Annales musicologiques*, III (1955), 7-37, hereinafter cited as *Annales*. Subsequent studies will be cited as they become relevant.

(5) Basing his views on the state of the notation used for the greater number of entries—the Coislin—and drawing attention to certain incompatible traits that this reveals, Floros concludes (I, 358-359) that the scribe may have sought to modernize the notation of an older model or, failing this, that the development of the Coislin notation may have progressed more rapidly on Mount Athos than elsewhere.

(6) Στιχεράριν stands for the etymologically more correct form Στιχηράριον, derived from στιχηρόν (*cf.* the adjective στιχηρός, for example in Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam*, 2, 30); to this has been added the suffix -άριον. The transition in the neighborhood of a liquid from the sound of the iotacized Eta to that of the Epsilon is a phenomenon encountered in Greek from late Antiquity until well into the Middle Ages (*cf.* K. Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrhundert n. Christus* [Byzantinisches Archiv, 1], Leipzig, 1898, p. 11-12; S. B. Psaltes, *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken* [Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik], Göttingen, 1913, p. 26). Also encountered as early as the pre-Christian era is the disappearance of the Omicron in masculine nouns in -ιος and neuter ones in -ιον (*cf.* Psaltes, *op. cit.*, p. 43-48).—E. Follieri.

THE NORMAL TRIODION

As indicated, the Triodion Vatopedi 1488 is a distinctly abnormal copy. Before we can deal adequately with its abnormalities we shall need to know exactly what a normal copy of the book may be expected to contain. Such a copy was published in 1935 as part of the first volume of the Monumenta's principal series—the "Codex Dalassenos," a typical thirteenth-century representative of the standard abridged version (1) of the Sticherarion, largely normal as regards the first half of its contents, entirely so as regards the second, the part that concerns us here. In introducing this volume, the editors offered a brief explanation of the way in which such a book is divided and of the contents of each of its divisions, and the reader may wish also to consult Professor Tillyard's prefaces and introductions in Volumes VII, III, and V of the Transcripta, with detailed analyses of the contents of the Pentekostarion and Oktoechos. For our present purposes, however, no one of these inventories goes far enough.

The book opens with the stichera for the four Sundays leading up to the beginning of the Orthodox Lent and corresponding, in Western terminology, to those for the period from the Sunday before Septuagesima to Quinquagesima Sunday—the Sundays of the Publican and Pharisee, of the Prodigal Son, of the Carnival (or Second Coming), and of the Cheese Fast (or Expulsion of Adam). There follow the stichera for the six weeks of Lent proper, which begins on the Monday after Quinquagesima and concludes with the Friday before Palm Sunday, and these are followed in turn by

(1) For the concept "standard abridged version," see *Annales*, III, 34-35, and my *Specimina Notationum Antiquiorum* (Copenhagen, 1966), Pars suppletoria, p. 16, 23-25, hereinafter cited as *Specimina*, also—for a dissenting view—Floros, *op. cit.*, I, 75-91.

those for Holy Week, which concludes with the Holy Saturday Vespers. For the six weeks of Lent proper the book provides in principle only two stichera for each of the days from Sunday to Friday (the so-called στιχερὰ τῆς ἡμέρας) and this arrangement is extended also to the final week of the Pre-Lenten season; for the Lenten Saturdays there are no provisions, with the notable exception of the first (the Saturday of St. Theodore) and the last (the Saturday of Lazarus); Palm Sunday is fully provided for, as are the first three days of Holy Week and the four preliminary Sundays with which the book begins; the Wednesday of Mid-Lent, with the ceremony of the Adoratio Crucis, and Maundy Thursday, with the Pedilavium, call for more elaborate treatment; most elaborate is the treatment of the Good Friday office, with the fifteen antiphons of the Holy Sufferings and the twelve troparia of the hour services.

Normal copies of the Sticherarion seldom treat the Triodion proper and the Pentekostarion as separate divisions, and since in the vast majority of them the stichera for Easter are simply omitted, the Sunday of St. Thomas, or Antipascha, may be expected to follow immediately on Holy Saturday. There remain then seven further Sundays—those of the Women at the Tomb, of the Paralytic, of the Woman of Samaria, of the Man Blind from Birth, of the Nicaean Fathers, of Pentecost, and of All Saints. The Ascension is commemorated on the Thursday preceding the Sunday of the Nicaean Fathers, and the seven-week period Easter to Pentecost is split into two equal parts on the Wednesday of the fourth week by the commemoration of Mid-Pentecost, corresponding exactly to the division of the seven-week period Lent plus Holy Week by the Mid-Lenten ceremony of the Adoratio Crucis.

A noteworthy feature of the Triodion is that a considerable part of its contents consists of stichera paraphrasing or even quoting literally from the Gospel lectionary. Those assigned to the two Sundays with which the book opens bear on appointed lessons from Luke (18.10–14; 15.11–32)—the parables of the Publican and Pharisee and of the Prodigal Son; in a similar way, those assigned to three of the Sundays after Easter bear on appointed lessons from John (5.1–15; 4.5–42; 9.1–38)—the miracles of the Paralytic, of the Woman of Samaria, and of the Man Blind from Birth. All this is in harmony with the definitive arrangement of the Gospel lectionary, according to which the lessons from Luke extend from mid-September to the Carnival, those from John from Easter to Pentecost. Yet during the six weeks of Lent, although the Sunday lessons of the definitive lectionary are drawn largely from Mark, the stichera assigned to the last four weeks bear once again on lessons from Luke, returning for the third and fourth weeks to the parables of the Prodigal Son and of the Publican and Pharisee and continuing for the fifth and sixth with those of the Good Samaritan (10.25–37) and of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16.1–31). Only too obviously, this part of the Triodion must have taken shape at a time prior to the introduction of the definitive Gospel lectionary, in a place where a wholly different arrangement of the lessons was followed. Knowing as we do what that arrangement was, we can identify it, with Anton Baumstark's help (2), as an arrangement dependent upon the Palestinian Gospel lectionary, followed in the Holy Land from the mid-seventh century until it yielded to Constantinopolitan usage. The Triodion, then, after agreeing for four weeks with the definitive Gospel lectionary from Constantinople, goes on to agree for six with an earlier one from Jerusalem, and this seeming incongruity invites a whole series of inferences. To begin with, it implies that the core of the Triodion consists of early compositions of Palestinian origin; it implies further that this core was expanded later on, probably in several stages, by the addition of the four preliminary Sundays, a conclusion borne out also by other evidence; it implies finally, although it cannot be said to prove, that the Constantinopolitan Gospel lectionary is a relatively late construction.

Quite apart from their dependence upon a divergent Gospel lectionary, the stichera for the six weeks of Lent, together with those for the week preceding the Expulsion of Adam, differ from the remainder of the Triodion in another respect: they are arranged in the order of their performance and provided with rubrics specifying the week, the day, and the hour (ἑσπέρας, πρωΐ). Likewise arranged in the order of their performance are the antiphons of the Holy Passions and the troparia of the Good Friday hours. For the rest, the stichera for the various Sundays and other days so-

(2) "Die sonntägliche Evangelienlesung im vorbyzantinischen Jerusalem," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXX (1929/30), 350-359.

lemnly celebrated continue the pattern already established in the first half of the Sticherarion: there is simply a heading giving the title of the feast, after which the single items follow in the neutral order of the modal cycle. The evident purpose of this arrangement is to make the book universally useful; it facilitates reference and leaves the individual community free to sing as many or as few of the stichera as its rule prescribes and to fit them into the framework of the services in accordance with that rule. To illustrate this point I list here in order the stichera for the Sunday with which the Triodion opens, summarizing then the directions for their use found in two early Typika conveniently accessible in modern editions, the one from the monastery of the Theotokos Euergetes in Constantinople (11th/12th century) (3), the other from the mo-

TABLE 1

Τῇ κυριακῇ τοῦ τελώνου καὶ τοῦ φαρισαίου

1 α Μὴ προσευξώμεθα φαρισαικῶς

2 α Φαρισαῖος κενοδοξίᾳ

3 γ Τοῦ τελώνου καὶ τοῦ φαρισαίου

4 γ Τοῦ φαρισαίου τὴν μεγάλαυχον φωνήν

5 πλ α Βεβαρημένων τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου

6 πλ δ Παντοκράτορ κύριε

7 πλ δ Ταῖς ἐξ ἔργων καυχήσεσι

	Euergetes	Messina	Triodion
At Vespers			
At the ordinary psalm	Τὴν ὑψηλόφρονα γνώμην 'Ατενίσαι τὸ ὄμμα	1, 2, 4	1, 2
At the doxology		6	6
At the verse	7, 6		
At the doxology		5	5
At the Orthros			
At the Lauds	1, 2	7	1, 2, 3, 4
At the doxology			7

(3) Aleksej Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgičeskich rukopisej* (Hildesheim, 1965 = Kiev & St. Petersburg, 1895-1917), hereinafter cited as Dmitrievskij. For the Typikon of the Euergetes monastery, see I, 256-656.

nastery of San Salvatore di Messina (1131) (4), showing further how they are fitted into the framework of the services in one of the earliest printed editions of the Triodion text (Venice, 1565) (Table 1).

The Typikon of the Euergetes monastery calls for only four of the seven stichera; as its rule informs us, those prescribed for singing with the Vesper Psalm are to be repeated on the third Sunday in Lent, the day to which they in fact belong. At San Salvatore there is no provision for the third of the seven stichera and it will be noticed that the directions of its Typikon depart also in other respects from those of the edition of 1565. These in turn agree perfectly with those of current editions, for example those of the Roman edition of 1879 or of the editions published in Athens by Saliveros (5).

The usual contents of the book's final section is admirably summarized by Professor Tillyard in the introduction to his *Hymns of the Octoechus, Part I* (Copenhagen, 1940), in the course of which he observes that while some sources arrange the contents in a systematic order, with the Anatolika, Alphabetika (6), and Anabathmoi (7) as separate collections, running through the modes three times, others prefer a cyclic arrangement, running through the modes only once and following under each mode the order of performance—Anatolika of the Saturday Vespers, Alphabetika, Anabathmoi, Anatolika of the Sunday Orthros, Anatolika of the Sunday Vespers. As examples of the two arrangements Tillyard cites

(4) Miguel Arranz, *Le Typikon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine* (Rome, 1969), hereinafter cited as Arranz, *Le Typikon.* Writing in the *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* for 1970, Julien Leroy argues that the MS published by Arranz is a thirteenth-century copy of the original and that the original itself cannot be as early as 1131, the date Arranz assigns to it.

(5) Other directions for this particular Sunday, chiefly from Italian sources, are printed in parallel columns in Teodoro Toscani, *Ad Typica Graecorum . . . animadversiones* (Rome, 1864), p. 52-55.

(6) On the vexed question of the authorship of the Anatolika and Alphabetika, see P. Bartolomeo Di Salvo, "Considerazioni sugli sticherà del vespero e delle laudi dell'októechos bizantino della domenica," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica,* XXXIII (1967), 161-175. The problem of the Alphabetika is also studied in my "Melody Construction in Byzantine Chant," cited in Note 11 below.

(7) For the Anabathmoi, see my "Antiphons of the Oktoechos," *Journal of the American Musicological Society,* XIII (1960), 50-67, hereinafter cited as "The Antiphons of the Oktoechos."

the "Codex Dalassenos," dated 1221, and the MS Athens, National Library 974, "probably of the thirteenth century." Today, with many more sources at our disposal than Tillyard could consult, we can recognize that until about the year 1250 the systematic arrangement was the one universally favored. Later thirteenth-century copies lean now in the one direction, now in the other, until about the year 1300, when the cyclic arrangement wins general acceptance and the use of the systematic arrangement ceases (8).

The three collections just mentioned, together with the eleven Heothina (9), constitute the stable part of the Oktoechos. To these, many copies add two further collections, the so-called Stichera Dogmatika in praise of the Blessed Virgin (10), and the Staurotheotokia with Her lament at the foot of the Cross. Both collections are unstable, even marginal, indeed it is scarcely too much to say that no two copies of the book contain precisely the same pieces. With the fourteenth century one begins to find also the Stichera Anastasima (11), sometimes only those sung at the Saturday Vespers, at other times the complete series. All of these addenda are treated at some length in Professor Tillyard's companion volume, *The Hymns of the Octoechus, Part II* (Copenhagen, 1949), which contains also an account of the contrafacta, or stichera prosomoia, written for the six weeks of Lent by Theodore Studites and his brother Joseph, Archbishop of Thessalonica (12). The single items of this series are often collected at the back of the book, as they are in the "Codex Dalassenos," and entered in the order of the calendar as a

(8) Among dated manuscripts, so far as my own observations extend, the last to use the systematic arrangement is Laura Δ. 3, dated 1304, the first to use the cyclic arrangement Athens, National Library 957, dated 1274.

(9) For the Stichera Heothina, paraphrasing the eleven Gospels of the Sunday Orthros, see also H. J. W. Tillyard, "The Morning Hymns of the Emperor Leo," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, XXX-XXXI (1928-31).

(10) "Padre Lorenzo Tardo ed il suo Ottoeco nei manoscritti melurgici: alcune osservazioni sugli Stichera Dogmatika," *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, XXI (1967), 21-34.

(11) For the Stichera Anastasima, see my comments on Egon Wellesz, "Melody Construction in Byzantine Chant," *Actes du XIIe congrès international d'études byzantines*, I (Belgrade, 1963), 365-373.

(12) For a more detailed account of these contrafacta, see Heinrich Husmann, "Die Prosomoia der Grossen Fastenzeit," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, XXIX (1972), 216-231, a part of his longer study "Strophenbau und Kontrafakturtechnik der Stichera."

sort of appendix, but in many copies, early and late, one finds them one, two, or three at a time within the Triodion proper, entered in place under the days on which they are actually sung. In either case, instead of offering the complete series of ninety pieces, our sources normally restrict themselves to the forty-nine that are sung to unfamiliar melodies (13).

(13) Exceptions to this rule are Grottaferrata, E.α.iii, and Sinai 1226. The first of these, a mutilated thirteenth-century Triodion, permits the recovery of the melodies not regularly transmitted in reasonably plausible versions; it was first brought to my attention by P. Bartolomeo Di Salvo. On the other hand, the versions of the second, a fifteenth-century Sticherarion, are unmistakably spurious (see also page 43 below); the manuscript was not microfilmed by the American expedition of 1950, but a negative made for me at the time of my visit to the monastery in 1958 has since been deposited in the Library of Congress.

THE TRIODION VATOPEDI 1488

Physical Description

The following description of the Triodion Vatopedi 1488 is based on the photographic reproduction of the manuscript and on detailed information regarding its external characteristics supplied in early April 1973 by Dr. Dimitri Conomos, who was kind enough to reëxamine the manuscript for us in the library at Vatopedi.

The manuscript Vatopedi 1488 is a parchment codex, made up of 217 folios, without subscription and thus without explicit indication of date and provenance. The parchment is evidently of poor quality; as is clear from the photographs, the surfaces have not been properly polished (1). Some folios show defects that antedate the writing (2). The present dimensions of the folios range in height from 163 to 170 mm., in width from 139 to 145; originally they were greater—the trimming has been especially severe at the top. The dimensions of the written surface range from 130 by 90 mm. to 135 by 95. The number of written lines on each page is regularly fourteen; the lines are so spaced to leave room for the signs of the musical notation.

In so far as one can judge from the present state of the codex and from the photographs, the dry-point ruling corresponds to Lake's Ruling Type I, 40a, characterized not only by the usual double line running from top to bottom, delimiting the written surface and precisely fixing the position of the initial letters protruding to the left, but also by another double line running from top to bottom in the outer margin and often serving to fix the position of the modal signatures.

The codex consists of quaternia, the sole exceptions being gathering 23 (folios 176 to 181), with six folios only, and gatherings 25

(1) *Cf.* for example, folios 2, 6, 16, &c.

(2) Folios 35, 79, 126, 137, 152, 173, 186, 196.

and 26 (folios 190 to 199, 200 to 209), with ten folios each. Following the usual Byzantine practice these are so arranged that the flesh-side forms the first and last page of each gathering. The gatherings have then been numbered progressively with Greek letter-numerals, now majuscule, now minuscule, inscribed in the lower inside corner of their first pages, apparently in the hand of the scribe himself—at all events in a contemporary hand. As a result of the trimming to which the codex has been subjected, many of these numbers have disappeared: there remain those for gatherings 1 to 4 (α to δ) on folios 1, 9, 17, and 25, and for gatherings 6 to 17 (ς to ιζ) on folios 41, 49, 56, 64, 72, 80, 88, 96, 104, 112, 120, and 128; only traces remain of the numbers 18 to 21 (ιη to κα) on folios 136, 144, 152, and 160; not even a trace of the remaining numbers 5 and 22 to 28 is to be seen on folios 33, 168, 176, 182, 190, 200, and 210. Gathering 7 (folios 49 to 55) consists of seven folios rather than eight; the fifth folio is wanting, it appears, but there is no lacuna in the text.

The hand is a very regular *Perlschrift* (3) in which there appear a certain number of majuscule letters. Generally speaking, their percentage is relatively low (4): calculations based on six folios (folios 2, 7, 11, 21, 185, and 201) yield the following percentages:

Alpha	0	Kappa	53.6%
Beta	0	Lambda	18.6%
Gamma	2.3%	Mu	0
Delta	0	Nu	0
Epsilon	4%	Pi	15.7%
Zeta	0	Sigma	3.6%
Eta	34%	Omega	7.1%

(3) Some whimsical flourishes are present in the last lines of folios 2, 67v, 73, 73v, 92, 111, 115v. On the *Perlschrift cf.* H. Hunger, *Studien zur griechischen Paläographie*, Wien 1954, p. 22–32; *idem*, "Antikes und mittelalterliches Buch- und Schriftwesen", in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung*, I, Zürich 1961, 96.

(4) On the reintroduction of majuscule letters in the minuscule script *cf.* E. Follieri, "La reintroduzione di lettere semionciali nei più antichi manoscritti greci in minuscola", in *Bullettino dell'Archivio paleografico italiano*, III s. I (1962), 15-36; J. Irigoin, "Structure et évolution des écritures livresques de l'époque byzantine", in *Polychronion, Festschrift Franz Dölger*, Heidelberg 1966, pp. 253-265.

As will be evident, on the folios we have examined there are no occurrences within the minuscule script of the majuscule forms of the letters Alpha, Beta, Delta, Zeta, Mu, and Nu. Among the letters in majuscule form seen on the same folios, the highest percentage is that of the letter Kappa (more than 50%), followed by Eta (34%); then at a certain distance follow Lambda and Pi, and after them with lower and lower percentages Omega, Epsilon, Sigma, and Gamma.

A characteristic letter is the open Theta, used often enough as a substitute for the closed Theta, especially as the first letter of a word or in ligature after Alpha, Epsilon, Lambda, Sigma, or Chi (5). Very frequent is the ligature of Sigma and Alpha, a little less so the analogous one of Tau and Alpha; in these the pen descends below the line to the right from above in order to join from below with the following Alpha (6), whose loop is made, with the preceding consonant, in a single stroke. Related to these are the less common ligatures of Delta with Alpha (7), of Epsilon with Alpha (8) or Omega (9), of Lambda with Alpha (10), of Pi with Alpha (11), of Sigma with Omega (12), and of Psi with Alpha (13). Noteworthy too is the cursive Epsilon in ligature with Lambda (14) or Nu (15).

Entirely in majuscule script are the headings (16), the modal

(5) These phenomena are documented as early as the mid-tenth century: *cf.* for example, the manuscripts Paris. gr. 668, a.D. 954 (L. Th. Lefort-J.Cochez, *Palaeographisch Album*, Leuven 1932, pl.33); Paris. gr. 497, a. D. 966 (Lefort-Cochez, *op. cit.*, pl. 39); Ambros. B. 106 sup., a. D. 967 (Lefort-Cochez, *op. cit.*, pl. 40).

(6) Examples of σα: folios 1v, last line; 2v, last line; 3v, line 6; 5, last line; 6, lines 2 and 12, &c.; examples of τα: folios 18v, line 2; 21v, line 8, &c.

(7) Folio 100, line 10.

(8) Folio 20, line 4.

(9) Folio 43, line 10.

(10) Folio 22, line 7.

(11) Folio 55, line 3.

(12) Folio 21v, line 8.

(13) Folio 23v, line 4.

(14) Folios 63, last line but one; 65v, line 10.

(15) Folios 56, line 12; 97v, line 2.

(16) For example, folio 1.

signatures (17), the rubrics (18), the incipits of model troparia (19), the heirmoi of the triodion on folios 104 verso to 106, the troparia without music, for example the one on folio 90. Aside from this, the use of majuscule letters prevails when verses from the Psalter are entered (20).

Entries that are otherwise in majuscule script throughout employ the minuscule Alpha in accordance with a usage that appears as early as the mid-tenth century (21) and becomes more and more firmly established in the course of the eleventh (22).

Breathings and accents are wanting in entries supplied with musical notation, but are present in those without—headings, rubrics, verses, and hymnographic texts (23). Following a practice characteristic of Byzantine scribes, entries provided with accents use a doubled grave accent to set off such monosyllables as μὲν, δὲ, μὴ, σὲ, and σοῦ (24).

Generally speaking, abbreviations are relatively rare, and they are avoided above all in texts provided with musical notation. Among the few examples of abbreviated *nomina sacra* found in texts with musical notation are χς (25), χυ (26), χε (27), θν (28), στρω (29), ουνιον (30), and ἀνοις (31). Such abbreviations are more

(17) Folios 3v, 5v, 6, 8, &c.
(18) Folios 84v, 86-87, 88, 88v, &c.; 166, 167v-168, 168-169, &c.
(19) Folios 63v, 88.
(20) Folios 84-88, 90v-102, &c.
(21) For example, in the manuscript Oxon. Bodl. auct. E. 2. 12, of the year 953 (Lefort-Cochez, *op. cit.*, pl. 32).
(22) In Mosqu. 299 Vlad., of the year 1022 (K. and S. Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, VI, Boston 1936, pl. 399), in Mosqu. 68 Vlad., of the year 1060 (Lake, *op. cit., vol. cit.*, pl. 406), in Vindob. theol. gr. 63, of the year 1061 (Lefort-Cochez, *op. cit.*, pl. 92), in Laurent. VII 24, of the year 1091 (Lefort-Cochez, *op. cit.*, pl. 93; Lake, *op. cit.*, X, Boston 1939, pl. 704).
(23) For example, on folios 90, 95v.
(24) *Cf.* for example, folio 95v.
(25) Folio 75, last line but one.
(26) Folio 67v, line 5.
(27) Folio 87v, line 1.
(28) Folio 91, line 3.
(29) Folio 99, line 10.
(30) Folio 96, line 12.
(31) Folio 58, line 8.

frequent in entries without music; see for example the rubrics on folio 86 verso (32) or the Makarismoi on folios 102 verso to 104 (33).

The same observations apply also to the graphic symbols standing for letters, groups of letters, and words. In texts with musical notation one sometimes encounters the abbreviation for καί in the form ς (34), but far more frequent are the cases in which the word is written out in full. Abbreviations of the final Nu and of the endings -ον, -ος, and -αις are rare indeed and occur as a rule at the end of a line (35); the same is true of the ligature ου (36). Other rarely used abbreviations are those for ης (37), for ους (38), for ας (39), for αν (40), for ην (41), and for ων (42). Where no musical notation is involved, as in the examples just given, one finds a few other abbreviations, such as those for γάρ (43), for μοναχός (44), for μάρτυς (45), and for μεγάλη (46). And in the rubrics, abbreviations by suspension are extremely common: κυ for κυριακῇ, ἑσπ for ἑσπέρας, σα for σαββάτῳ, among others.

As far as folio 200, brown ink is used for the minuscule script and for the musical notation; beginning with folio 200, the minuscule script is black, while the neumes continue to be written in brown.

(32) θσ line 9, πηρ line 13, ισ line 12, κε line 7.
(33) στρωσον, σηρ, χν, στρω, φιλανε, χε, σερ, πρα, πνα, μρα, &c.
(34) Folio 3 line 5, folio 4 line 1, folio 13 line 10, &c.
(35) For the final -ν *cf.* folio 10 line 8, folio 185 line 2; for the ending -ον *cf.* folio 85 line 6; for the ending -ος *cf.* folio 85v line 6, folio 185 last line but one; for the ending -αις *cf.* folio 85 last line.
(36) *Cf.* folios 45, line 14; 49, last line; 51, third line from below; 67, last line but one, &c.
(37) Folio 56, last line.
(38) Folio 74, last line.
(39) Folio 86v, line 3.
(40) Folio 99v, line 5.
(41) *Ibidem.*
(42) Folio 86, third line from below.
(43) Folio 68, line 8.
(44) As $\overset{χ}{μο}$ or $\overset{χ}{α}$: for the first of these see folios 69, line 8, 73, line 2; for the second, folio 81, line 1; the plural $\overset{χ}{μο}\,\overset{χ}{μο}$ can be seen on folios 84v line 8, 87 last line but one, &c.
(45) $\overset{ρρ}{μμ}$ = μάρτυρες on folio 92, line 8.
(46) $\overset{Γ}{μ}$ = μεγάλη, for example on folio 74, last line.

On the whole the ornamentation is relatively modest. A vignette of interwoven colored bands—clear red, sky-blue, and faded yellow—embellishes the beginning of the codex on folio 1, and on folio 178 there is another rather elaborate one—red, yellow, and brown—marking the beginning of the Stichera Anatolika. Simpler interwoven bands, dark brown or black, occur also on other folios (47). More frequent are ornaments of the simplest sort, consisting in a broken double line (48), or in a single undulating line (49), or in a chain of little curved strokes, terminating at either end in a knot with three loops (50). Red ink is used for the band on folio 125 verso. As a rule an asterisk marks the beginning of a heading (51).

Although they differ in their dimensions and in the degree of their ornamentation, the initial letters may be reduced to three types. The most elaborate of these is the one represented by the Tau on folios 20, 22 verso, 176, and 184, by the Pi on folio 8 verso, by the Iota on folios 27 verso and 39 verso, by the Mu on folio 29 verso, or by the Kappa on folio 160; in these initials the vertical shafts are embellished by knots and the upper and lower extremities by foliage in accordance with the manner that Kurt Weitzmann has called the *Blütenblattstil* (52). In the initials of the second type the shafts are embellished by little swellings, like those of buds on a branch, while the extremities draw once again on botanical models (53). The initials of the third type are the simplest: smaller in scale than the types just described, they have as a rule no embellishment other than a doubling of the outline and an enlarge-

(47) On folios 55, 201v, 212.
(48) Folios 71, 119, 199.
(49) Folios 184, 186v, 205v, 213v.
(50) Folios 3v, 13, 49v, 59, 82v, &c.
(51) *Cf.* folios 6, 10, 12, &c.
(52) K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1935, p. 22-32.
(53) See for example the letter Alpha on folios 3v, 10, 11, 15, 17, 25, 34v; the Beta on folios 2v, 11; the Delta on folios 4, 20, 23; the Eta on folios 24, 25v, 34, 39; the Theta on folio 27; the Kappa on folio 18v; the Lambda on folio 45v; the Mu on folios 26v, 29, 42v; the Nu on folios 17, 18, 18v; the Pi on folios 9v, 12, 30v; the Chi on folio 31; the Omega on folio 45.

ment of the extremities (54). Here and there one encounters forms whose simplicity is even more linear (55).

Red ink is used for the initials Sigma and Alpha on folios 125 verso and 126, also for the initials Sigma and Tau on folio 178. Other initials, headings, marginal references, modal indications, and the bands listed above (unless otherwise specified) are written in the usual ink over faded yellow strips applied with a brush; it is this that has caused these rubrics and ornaments to stand out. Faded yellow strips are also found under the texts on folios 115, 115 verso to 117, and 167 verso to 168 (56).

Of the numerous corrections, some involve erasures, others are interpolations added as a rule by the scribe himself, usually in the margin, seldom above the line. The most conspicuous erasures are those on folios 3 verso (57), 4 (58), 31 (59), and 108 verso (60). Erasures of less moment can be seen on folios 14 verso (lines 2 and 8 to 9), 36 (lines 4 to 5), 53 verso (line 5), 66 (line 7), 67 (line 11). Among the marginal interpolations we mention only those on folios 2 verso (61), 10 (62), and 16 (63); all such interpolations

(54) See the Alpha on folios 25v, 37, 46v; the Beta on folio 105v; the Gamma on folio 165; the Delta on folio 122v; the Epsilon on folio 4v; the Eta on folios 14 and 65v; the Iota on folio 111; the Kappa on folio 69v; the Lambda on folio 57; the Mu on folio 101; the Omicron on folios 14, 26; the Pi on folios 2v, 5v; the Sigma on folio 67; the Tau on folio 62; the Phi on folio 101; the Omega on folio 6v.
(55) For example, in the Zeta on folios 43 and 182v, in the Iota on folios 83 and 83v, in the Lambda on folio 188, in the Pi on folio 166, in the first Upsilon on folio 197v, in the Omega on folio 64.
(56) For the yellow strips applied to Greek manuscripts from Southern Italy and other regions of the Byzantine world, for example Asia Minor, see R. Devreesse, *Les manuscrits grecs de l'Italie méridionale* (Studi e testi 183), Città del Vaticano, 1955, p. 30.
(57) Lines 9-10.
(58) Here, in the last line but one, the words ο αναστας εκ νεκρων τριημερος have been erased, and in their place, before the clause και ελεησον με, another hand has written the words ο θεος.
(59) Lines 4-6. The erasure begins with the words ο δι εμε and ends, as it seems, with εγερσι σου.
(60) Line 8. The words erased may be restored as λαος δυσσεβης και παρανομος.
(61) νω, to complete the form φρωνωμεν in line 6.
(62) The marginal emendation φονα του ν[υμ] belongs to line 4 and results in the reading τον νυμ⟨φονα του νυμ⟩φιου.
(63) After αλλοις, in line 7, there is to be inserted the marginal addition

are supplied with musical notation. In the margins one finds also a few corrections or variants for the music of the hymns (64). The interlinear interpolations are shorter and less frequent; examples can be seen on folios 53 (65) and 67 (66).

As a rule the scribe has used the left-hand margin to enter the conventionalized abbreviation for θεοτοκίον (67) and the familiar solar symbol for τριαδικόν (68) as also to distinguish the stichera ὅμοια (69). On the other hand, the outer margins (the margin to the right on the recto page, that to the left on the verso) are used for the modal signatures when these are not included in the headings, also for annotations bearing on the day and on the hour. Beyond these, there are further marginal notes, sufficiently numerous, some in the hand of the scribe, others in other hands.

In the hand of the scribe are the annotations one finds on folios 113 (right-hand margin), 115 (right-hand margin), and 194 verso (left-hand margin); two of these involve references to the Prophetologion, the third makes good an omission (70).

Marginal additions in other hands have been inserted at various times. A relatively early hand (saec. XI to XII?) has added the text-incipits of the Martyrika and Theotokia on folios 18 verso to 19 and on folios 27 to 29; another hand, slightly more recent (saec. XII to XIII?) has entered in the left-hand and lower margins of folio 36 verso (71) a troparion supplied with musical notation; this same hand, perhaps, has added the annotation on folio 76 (72).

φοβερος ν[υν] | καταπλη[σσο]|μ[αι]. Other analogous emendations may be seen on folios 27v (lower margin), 42v, 48v, 49v, 57v, 68, 69v, 75, 75v, 79v, 133v, 144v, 158v, 159.

(64) To this class belongs the syllable οι with musical notation on folio 172 to the right of line 12 (in the hand of the copyist, it appears).

(65) Line 5: εκ written above βοησωμεν.

(66) Line 10: ουτω corrected to ουτωσ.

(67) *Cf.* for example, folios 36v (line 3), 39v, 40, 64v, 66, 80v, &c.

(68) For example, on folios 104, 171, 172, 202, 202v, 203, 203v, 204, 204v, 205, 205v, &c.

(69) Folios 64, 67v, 71v, 72v, 74v, &c.

(70) On folio 194v, the words ἕτερ(ον) στιχ(η)ρ(ον) εἰς το | [τέλος] τοῦ βιβλίου:- [εκ]ἰθ(εν) γὰρ ἐγράφη | ἤ(χος):-πλ. β are a reference to the sticheron entered on folio 201v (beginning σταυρωθεις ως ηβουληθης).

(71) The entry runs over into the lower margin of folio 37.

(72) στιχχ. τη [αγια] | και μ(ε)γ(α)λ(η) δ [εἰς τοὺς] | αἶνου[ς]: a repetition of the rubric at the head of folio 74v.

Still another hand, roughly contemporary but with a more cursive *ductus*, has added the cross references in the lower margins of folios 116 verso and 118 verso. Somewhat later (saec. XV) are the rubrics in the outer margins of folios 173 verso to 177 for the stichera of the Sunday of All Saints. On folio 107 verso a rather clumsy hand has prescribed the omission of the sticheron Ἄμπελος ἀληθινή, writing in the outer margin the two imperatives ἄφες and ἄρξε (for ἄρξαι). And at the end of the manuscript, on folio 217 verso, a more cultivated hand has added the text-incipit of the Christmas idiomelon Δεῦτε ἀνυμνήσωμεν τὴν μητέρα. Finally, there is the note of ownership on folio 211, identifying the manuscript as the property of the Vatopedi monastery (73), and on folio 212 one finds the sprawling signature of a Monachos Joannes, not otherwise identified (74). The remaining marginalia are today no longer legible (75).

In the lower margin of folio 1 there is inscribed the manuscript's earlier call-number, ξβ′ (=62) (76), followed by a modern conjecture as to its date—perhaps one ought to read ⟨ι⟩ α′ αἰῶνος. And on folios 1, 2, and 3 one finds the seal of the Vatopedi library, stamped in ink, most clearly on folio 3, with a representation of the scene of the Annunciation, the feast to which the monastery's katholikon is consecrated (77).

Our scribe's orthography is slovenly in the extreme, with innumerable errors due to iotacism and to homophony in general.

---

(73) Added by a later hand (15th/16th century?)

(74) ὁ ἁμαρτ(ω)λ(ος) ἰω(αννης) τάχα (καὶ) (μον)α(χ)ος (perhaps from the 13th/14th century).

(75) *Cf.* folios 10v, 26, 68, 72v.

(76) The present signature (1488) is that assigned to the manuscript in the catalogue by Eustratiades-Arcadios, published in 1924, but prepared as early as 1918 (*cf.* S. Eustratiades in Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς, II [1918], 734). The manuscripts at Vatopedi are still cited with their old signatures by Th. I. Schmit in his "Katalog žitijnych rukopisej Vatopedskago monastyrja na Athonĕ", in *Izvĕstija Russkago archeologičeskago Instituta v Konstantinopolĕ*, VIII (1902), 264-298, and by V. N. Beneševič, in his "Εἰδήσεις περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Βατοπεδίῳ καὶ τῇ Λαύρᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου τοῦ Ἀθωνίτου εὑρισκομένων ἑλληνικῶν κανονικῶν χειρογράφων", in *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, XI (1904), Priloženie, 2, p. 3, 5-45.

(77) *Cf.* G. Smyrnakes, Τὸ Ἅγιον Ὄρος, ἐν Ἀθήναις 1903, p. 432.

He writes ει for η (78), η for ει (79), ει for ι (80), ι for ει (81), η for ι (82), ι for η (83), αι for ε (84), ε for αι (85), ο for ω (86), ω for ο (87). As a rule υ and οι are treated as interchangable (88), thus we find υ for οι (89) and οι for υ (90). But there are also

(78) Folio 2v, line 4, μησεισαντες for μισησαντες; folio 4, line 6, πατρικεις for πατρικης, line 8, οικεισας for οικησας, line 13, κλειθηναι for κληθηναι; folio 7v, line 9, φθασει for φθαση, &c.

(79) Folio 2v, line 7, κατανυξη for -ξει; folio 4, line 1, εκτηνας for εκτεινας, line 12, ημει for ειμι; folio 5, line 4, επιτελη for επιτελει; folio 6, line 9, εκηνην for εκεινην, &c.

(80) Folio 4, line 12, ημει for ειμι, line 14, μεισθειων for μισθιων; folio 7v, line 13, δειψωντας for διψωντας, &c.

(81) Folio 2, line 3, αναστασι for αναστασει; folio 3, line 14, ταπεινωσι for ταπεινωσει; folio 4v, lines 3/4, αμελιας for αμελειας; folio 5v, line 12, αχριον for αχρειον; folio 6, line 12, ηχησι for ηχησει, &c.

(82) Folio 1v, lines 5/6, μησισον for μισησον; folio 2, line 11, κλημομενος for κλινομενος; folio 2v, lines 1/2, στιρηξον for στηριξον, line 4, μησεισαντες for μισησαντες; folio 4, line 9, πολητων for πολιτων, &c.

(83) Folio 1v, line 6, υπεριφανον for υπερηφανον, line 10, πλιθει for πληθει; folio 2, line 8, νιστειας for νηστειας, line 13, εστεριθη for εστερηθη; folio 2v, line 6, υψιλα for υψηλα, &c.

(84) Folio 2, line 10, καινοδοξιαν for κενοδοξια; folio 3, lines 12/13, αιξουδενοις for εξουδενοις; folio 3v, line 11, μαι for με; folio 4v, line 6, σαι for σε; folio 5v, line 3, δωραιας for δωρεας, &c.

(85) Folio 3, lines 4/5, φαρισεων for φαρισαιον; folio 3v, lines 5/6, ταλεπορος for ταλαιπωρος, line 8, ταλενα for ταλαινα; folio 4v, line 6, ετω for αιτω; folio 5, line 11, δεξε for δεξαι, &c.

(86) Folio 2, line 5, προσευξομεθα for προσευξωμεθα, line 10, νικομενος for νικωμενος; folio 3v, lines 5/6, ταλεπορος for ταλαιπωρος; folio 4, line 6, ασωτος for ασωτως; folio 4v, line 9, τον for των, &c.

(87) Folio 2, line 6, εαυτων for εαυτον, line 7, εναντιων for εναντιον, lines 8/9, κραζωντες for κραζοντες; folio 2v, line 12, των for τον; folio 3, line 2, ανηγαγων for ανηγαγον, &c.

(88) Until a relatively late date (roughly the 10th century A. D.) the diphthong οι was pronounced ü and hence confused with Upsilon: *cf.* H. Pernot, *D'Homère à nos jours*, Paris 1921, p. 141, 145-147; E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, München 1939, 195. One may consult also the observations of E. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* (Subsidia hagiographica 33), Bruxelles 1961, p. 229, note 1.

(89) Folio 3, line 13, συ for σοι; folio 3v, line 8, λυπον for λοιπον; folio 4v, line 4, εστυβασα for εστοιβασα; folio 8, lines 4/5, ητυμασμενην for ητοιμασμενην; folio 9, line 3, υδηματα for οιδηματα, &c.

(90) Folio 1v, line 7, ευκατανοικτον for ευκατανυκτον; folio 3, line 1, δακροια for δακρυα; folio 7, line 7, νοικτη for νυκτι; folio 9v, line 12, φοιλακες for φυλακες; folio 11v, line 7, βαβοιλωνι for βαβυλωνι, &c.

cases, admittedly less frequent, in which υ is confused with η (91) and with ι (92) and οι with ι (93) and with η (94).

Turning now to the writing of the consonants, Beta is sometimes confused with Upsilon (95), doubled consonants and groups of consonants may be reduced (96), and single consonants doubled (97). The Nu moveable often precedes a consonant (98); sufficiently common, too, is the use of a pleonastic Nu to terminate the accusative singular of nouns and adjectives of the third declension (99). There are also other slips that cannot be explained as due to pronunciation; these can be attributed only to the slovenliness of the scribe (100).

In format, script, ornamentation, and the numbering of its fascicles, Vatopedi 1488 exhibits striking affinities with another manuscript—likewise hymnographic in content—copied for the Vatopedi monastery in 1021/22. This is the codex Mosquensis gr. 299 (Vladimir), brought from Vatopedi to Russia by Arsenij Suchanov who, in the course of his mission to Athos from October 1653 to February 1655, acquired some five hundred Greek manuscripts, chosen from among the earliest and most beautiful specimens (101).

(91) Folio 22, line 2, πανυγυρισωμεν for πανηγυρισωμεν; folio 41v, line 7, διερρυγνητο for διερρηγνυτο; folio 110v, line 1, υμας for ημας; folio 125, line 14, νυδυως for νηδυος, &c.

(92) Folio 23, lines 4/5, δωριαλλοτον for δορυαλωτον; folio 53v, lines 9/10, υποκεκριμενη for υποκεκρυμμενη.

(93) Folio 25v, line 12, επαμφοιενοιτε for επαμφιεννυται; folio 69v, line 12, φοιλοις for φιλοις ; vice versa folio 22, line 10, πικιλοις for ποικιλοις.

(94) Folio 4, line 10, συνηκεσιον for συνοικεσιον; folio 5, line 3, της for τοις; folio 122, line 2, υπνη for υπνοι.

(95) Folio 49v, line 4, ευδ(ομας) for εβδ(ομας); folio 91v, line 5, ευρεων for εβραιων.

(96) Folio 2v, line 6, αλ for αλλ'; folio 6, lines 4/5, αχραντου σου for αχραντους σου, &c.; folio 6, line 12, σαλπιξ for σαλπιγξ.

(97) Folio 2, line 10, φαρισσαιος for φαρισαιος; folio 6v, line 1, γεννησονται for γενησονται; folio 7, lines 3/4, υποσστησεται for υποστησεται; folio 8v, line 11, καλλως for καλος, &c.

(98) Folio 5v, lines 13/14, εγυμνοσεν με, line 14, ηρεν μου; folio 10, line 8, εφθασεν γαρ; folio 11, line 13, ανετειλεν το, &c.

(99) Folio 12, line 2, σαρκαν; folio 19, line 10, γαστεραν; folio 21, lines 7/8, μαρτυραν; folio 23v, line 3, φλογαν; folio 54v, line 9, ψυχωφελην; folio 120v, line 14, πατεραν, &c.

(100) Folio 15v, line 1, καταυνασωμεν for κατευνασωμεν; folio 82, line 8, ανεξεκακε for ανξεικακε; folio 103, line 6, βασισιλεια for βασιλεια, &c.

(101) Exhaustive information and bibliographic notes on Arsenij Suchanov's

Mosquensis gr. 299 contains on folios 1 to 202 a cycle of paracletic canons for the Virgin, according to the eight modes, on folios 203 to 257 a series of canons for other occasions. Only the text is entered, without musical notation. On folio 257 one finds the subscription of the scribe, a certain Monachos Joannes from a monastery of St. John the Evangelist whose precise location is not specified; he declares that he has undertaken the copying of the canons for the Virgin belonging to the office celebrated at the Vatopedi monastery during the all-night services following Compline, or Apodeipnon (102), and that he has been commissioned to do this by Athanasios, kathegoumenos of Vatopedi, in the Anno Mundi 6530 (=1021/22 A. D.) (103); on folio 203, at the end of the strictly Marian canons, there is a similar note, wanting only the date (104).

---

mission to Mount Athos will be found in P. Lemerle's "La Vie ancienne de saint Athanase l'Athonite composée au début du XI^e siècle par Athanase de Lavra", in *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos. Études et Mélanges*, I, Chevetogne 1963, 65.

(102) On the term ἀπόδειπνον – ἀποδείπνιον, see the liturgical index published by M. Arranz, in *Le Typicon*, p. 385-386.

(103) For a description of Mosqu. gr. 299 see Arch. Vladimir, *Sistematičeskoe opisanie rukopisej Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj Biblioteki*, I, Rukopisi grečeskija, Moskva 1894, 412-413; also Chr. Fr. de Matthaei, *Accurata codicum Graecorum mss. Bibliothecarum Mosquensium Sanctissimae Synodi notitia et recensio*, II, Lipsiae 1805, 313-314 (Codices in quarto, XXII); Arch. Amfilochij, *Paleografičeskoe opisanie grečeskich rukopisej XI i XII v.*, II, Moskva 1880, 7. There are photographic reproductions of the manuscript in G. Cereteli-S. Sobolevski, *Exempla Codicum Graecorum litteris minusculis scriptorum annorumque notis instructorum*, I, Codices Mosquenses, Mosquae 1911, pl. XV (*cf.* the description on p. 9), and K. and S. Lake, *op. cit.*, VI, ms. 225, pl. 399. There are ample specimens of the manuscript's decorative style—initials and vignettes—reproduced in the form of drawings in the previously cited publication of the Archimandrite Amfilochij, II, pl. III-IV. To be consulted also in this connection are K. Weitzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 38-39, and J. Irigoin, "Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins", in *Scriptorium*, XIII (1959), 204.

(104) Transcribed in Cereteli—Sobolevski, *op. cit.*, p. 9, and in Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 11 (see also the photographic reproduction, pl. 399 b), the subscription reads: 'Ετελέσθη τὸ παρὸν τοῦτο βιβλίον τὸ ἔχον | τοὺς κανόνας τῆς ὑπὲρ-άγίας Θ(εοτο)κου τῶν | ἀπὸδειπνίων τῆς μονῆς του Βατοπε|δίου, δια χειρὸς 'Ιω(αννου) ἐλαχίστου μ(ονα)χ(ου) τῆς μο(νης) | τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ πανευφήμου ἀπο(στολου) καὶ εὐαγ|γελιστοῦ Ιω(αννου) τοῦ θεολόγου· προστάξει 'Αθα|-νασίου ('Αθανασίου erasum) τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου καθ'ἡγουμέ(νου) κυ(ρου) | 'Αθα-νασίου τῆς αὐτῆς μο(νης) τοῦ γέρωντος | ἔτους ,ςφλ· οἱ οὖν ἀναγινώσκον|τες εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ δια τὸν κ(υριο)ν✝. Then on folio 203 (*cf.* Cereteli-Sobolevski, *loc. cit.*) there is this note: τέλος εἴληφαν ἐνταῦθα οἱ τῶν παννυχί|δων

The kathegoumenos Athanasios is presumably the man whose signature is found on a document dated April 1035, emanating from the council of Athos hegoumenoi and conserved in the archives of the Laura (105).

The Kanonarion now in Moscow is a parchment codex; according to the description published by G. Cereteli and S. Sobolevski (106), its folios measure 182 by 145 mm., dimensions very similar to those of Vatopedi 1488 (from 163 to 170 mm. by 139 to 145), the more so in view of the severe trimming to which the Vatopedi Triodion was subjected in relatively recent times when all manuscripts at Vatopedi were rebound (107).

The ruling of Mosquensis gr. 299 belongs to Lake's simplest type (108) while that of Vatopedi 1488 seems somewhat more elaborate (109); in compensation the gatherings of the Moscow manuscript are numbered with Greek letter-numerals and, as in the one at Vatopedi, these are inscribed in the lower inside corner of each gathering's first page (110). The script of the Kanonarion now in

---

κανόνες· τῶ ἀριθμῶ ὄντες (spat. vac.) | γραφέντες δια χειρὸς 'Ιω(άννου) τοῦ ἐλαχίστου μ(ονα)χ(οῦ). | προστάξει 'Αθανασίου τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς πατρὸς καὶ | καθήγουμέ(νου) τῆς εὐαγεστάτης ταῦτης μο(νῆς) | τῆς ὑπὲρἁγίας Θ(εοτό)κου τοῦ Βατοπεδίου | κῦρ 'Αθανασίου τοῦ γέροντος· οἱ οὖν ἐν|τυγχάνοντες ἐν αὐτῷ· πρῶτον μὲν | συγχωρήσατέ μοι δια τὸν κ(ύριο)ν εἴ τι εἰς αὐ|τὸ ἐξ αφελώτητος καὶ ἰδιοτείας ἐσφάλην: | ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ εὔχεσθ(ε) ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα μοι δῶη | ὁ κ(ύριο)ς μερίδα καὶ κλῆρον μετὰ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ: —

(105) Editio princeps: Alexandros E. Lavriotes, in *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, VI (1899), 458-459 (with the incorrect date 1033); a mention also in Smyrnakes, *op. cit.*, p. 42 (with the date 1032, also incorrect); critical editions: G. Rouillard—P. Collomp, *Actes de Lavra*, I (Archives de l'Athos, I), Paris 1937, 63-64, num. 24 (with the correct date, April 1035 A. D., corresponding to the date Anno mundi 6543, third indiction, as given in the document); P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra*, I^ère partie (Archives de l'Athos, V), Paris 1970, 184-186, num. 24. Athanasios signs himself 'Αθανάσιος μοναχὸς καὶ ἡγούμενος τοῦ Βατοπεδίου.

(106) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

(107) E. Amand de Mendieta, *La presqu'île des Caloyers: le Mont-Athos*, Bruges 1955, p. 219. Dr. Conomos informs us that Father Matthew of Vatopedi believes (but is not certain) that the manuscript was rebound by Evstratios, a monk of the monastery who died about the year 1906.

(108) Type I, 1a: *cf.* Lake, *op. cit.*, VI, 11; Irigoin, "Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins", p. 204.

(109) Type I, 40a.

(110) For this peculiarity, *cf.* Irigoin, *art. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

Moscow is a typical *Perlschrift* (111), with certain of the ligatures found so frequently in Vatopedi 1488 (σα, τα, πα) (112). A count of the majuscule letters on the two pages from Mosquensis gr. 299 reproduced by Cereteli-Sobolevski yields the following percentages:

Epsilon	15.5%	Lambda	30.9%
Zeta	29.1%	Mu	14%
Eta	34.7%	Nu	2.5%
Kappa	48.6%	Pi	12.4%

Like Vatopedi 1488 (113) the Moscow manuscript contains no examples of Alpha, Beta, or Delta in majuscule form; very similar, in the two manuscripts, are the percentages of the majuscule Eta, Kappa, and Pi (114); on the folios examined there is a certain difference in the percentages for the letters Gamma (115), Epsilon (116), Zeta, (117) Lambda (118), Mu (119), Nu (120), Sigma (121), and Omega (122).

In the Moscow manuscript, as in the one at Vatopedi, the headings and heirmoi are written entirely in majuscule letters, but in the one at Moscow the letter Alpha also has the majuscule form (or at least a form closer to majuscule than minuscule) while in Vatopedi 1488 the Alpha is invariably minuscule. And in so far as one can judge from the limited number of folios from Moscow available in reproduction, the ornamentation of the two manuscripts is sufficiently similar; compare, for example, the vignette of interwoven bands on the first folio of Vatopedi 1488 with the one on Plate 399 in Lake's publication. In general, however, the ornamentation of the Moscow manuscript seems more elaborate

(111) *Cf.* Irigoin, *art. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

(112) *Cf.* Lake, *op. cit.*, VI, pl. 399a, lines 13, 10, 20.

(113) See above, p. 13.

(114) Respectively 34; 53.6; 15.7 in Vatopedi 1488; 34.7; 48.6; 12.4 in Mosqu. gr. 299.

(115) 2.3% in Vatopedi 1488, wanting in Mosqu. gr. 299.

(116) 4 % in Vatopedi; 15.5 % in Mosqu. gr.

(117) Wanting in Vatopedi; 29.1 % in Mosquensis.

(118) 18.6 % in Vatopedi; 30.9 % in Mosquensis.

(119) Wanting in Vatopedi; 14 % in Mosquensis.

(120) Wanting in Vatopedi; 2.5 % in Mosquensis.

(121) 3.6 % in Vatopedi; wanting in Mosquensis.

(122) 7.1 % in Vatopedi; wanting in Mosquensis.

(123), and the same is true of the initials (124). As in Vatopedi 1488, these are of several types: the more important ones, with knots and foliage, belong to the *Blütenblattstil*, as do those of Vatopedi 1488; the simpler ones, purely linear (125), approach the comparable initials of the Vatopedi Triodion rather more closely. In my judgement, however, the two manuscripts cannot be assigned to the same scribe. The script of the anonymous compiler of Vatopedi 1488 is decidedly vertical, while that of the Monachos Joannes leans as decidedly to the right and appears rather more cursive. Add to this that the script of Vatopedi 1488 is smaller and more rounded. Other differences come to light when one studies individual letters attentively: for example, the minuscule Gamma of the Triodion terminates below the line in a sharp point, while that of the Kanonarion is less sharply pointed and at times actually rounded; in Vatopedi 1488 the two oblique strokes of the majuscule Kappa join the vertical one, while in Mosquensis gr. 299 they remain detached.

None the less, the two manuscripts unquestionably belong to the same cultural milieu and to the same period: broadly speaking, the cultural milieu is that of the Athos scriptoria (126), more narrowly and very probably that of the scriptorium at Vatopedi (127); the

(123) *Cf.* the drawings published by Amfilochij, *op. cit.*, II, pl. III-IV.

(124) Amfilochij, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* On the decoration of the Moscow codex *cf.* also Weitzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 38-39.

(125) *Cf.* Lake, *op. cit.*, VI, pl. 399a.

(126) *Cf.*, for the activity of the Athonite scriptoria (Lavra, Iviron, Vatopedi) at the end of the tenth century and during the first quarter of the eleventh: Weitzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 35-39; Irigoin, *art. cit.*, in *Scriptorium*, XIII (1959), 195-204 ("Les premiers centres de copie de l'Athos").

(127) Mosqu. gr. 299, although surely copied at Vatopedi, is the work of a monk belonging to another community; for this reason Irigoin is entirely correct in saying (*art. cit.*, p. 204) that it ought not to be considered "comme un pur produit du scriptorium de Vatopédi"; at the same time he emphasizes its similarity to other Athonite manuscripts (especially to those of Theophanes of Iviron). The "hybrid" origin of the Moscow Kanonarion perhaps explains the differences we encounter on comparing it with Vatopedi 1488. Not until the year 1106, as Irigoin observes (*ibidem*), do we encounter another dated manuscript surely copied at Vatopedi: it is Leninopolitanus gr. 789, a monumental Sticherarion, whose graphic and codicological characteristics are decidedly different from those of Vatopedi 1488 and Mosquensis gr. 299 (reproductions in Cereteli-Sobolevski, *op. cit.*, II, Codices Petropolitani, Mosquae 1913, pl. XXII-XXIIa; Lake, *op. cit.*, VI, ms. 243, pl. 437-438, 439b).

period is the first half of the eleventh century, and perhaps the first thirty years (128).

SOURCES AND ATTRIBUTIONS

We know already that the manuscript Vatopedi 1488 is an abnormal copy of the Triodion—abnormal in that it contains a substantial number of more or less unfamiliar items, many of them otherwise encountered only in our earliest sources, abnormal also in that, in accordance with a predetermined plan, consistently followed, it employs two distinct varieties of the early musical notation, the Coislin and the Chartres. Its compiler has drawn, obviously, on two *Vorlagen*, or groups of *Vorlagen*, one for each of the notational varieties he has used, and in so doing he has brought us near to the very beginnings of the written tradition for the texts and melodies of the Sticherarion. Our task, accordingly, is not so much to establish the date and provenance of the manuscript itself—these co-ordinates have already been sufficiently established by Miss Follieri in her account of its physical characteristics—as it is to discover what lies behind its abnormalities, in other words to identify and study its closest relatives among our earlier sources and with their help to ascertain the nature and provenance of its *Vorlagen* and the principles according to which its compiler has arranged and ordered their contents.

We shall need to begin by examining the unfamiliar part of our manuscript's repertory item by item. But we shall need also to bear in mind that relationships among manuscripts of this sort do not turn solely on identity or similarity of contents. Closely related manuscripts may be expected to agree in their tradition for text and melody; liturgical considerations will need to be taken into account—rubrics, and where these are present, proper verses from the Psalter, references to Psalter readings and to lessons from the Old and New Testaments, rules for the conduct of particular offices,

(128) The Vatopedi monastery was founded at some time between 972 and 980: *cf.* K. Vlachos, Ἡ χερσόνησος τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους Ἄθω καὶ αἱ ἐν αὐτῇ μοναὶ καὶ οἱ μοναχοὶ πάλαι τε καὶ νῦν, ἐν Βόλῳ 1903, p. 184; C. Korolevskij, in *Dict. Hist. Géogr. Eccl.*, V, Paris 1931, articles Athos, col. 54-124, especially col. 57-59.

among them the Pedilavium and the Gonyklisia (1). In these as in other respects, the closer the agreement, the closer the relationship.

As a general rule, manuscript choir-books contain no attributions to individual poet-composers. But where these are found, even sporadically as they are in Vatopedi 1488, they may be highly significant. Heading our manuscript's list is the ubiquitous Joannes Monachos with fourteen attributions of one or more troparia (2); after him follow Cosmas Monachos with five (3), Theophanes with four (4), and with one each Andrew of Crete (5) and Theodore Studites (6). The Theophanes in question can only be Theophanes Protothronos, a member of the circle around the Emperor Leo VI (7). Strangely enough, however, Vatopedi never mentions the Emperor himself, although it contains twelve compositions explicitly attributed to him in trustworthy early sources (8).

Making due allowance for the imperfections of the fragmentary Triodia at the Laura, Γ. 67 and Γ. 72, and for differences in their contents, the attributions of these two sources do not differ greatly from those of Vatopedi 1488; the names encountered in the three manuscripts are the same; they occur with something like the same relative frequency, and there are no outright disagreements. Rather more revealing is their similar treatment of the Emperor Leo. Like Vatopedi 1488, Laura Γ. 72 never mentions him

(1) For the Pedilavium and the Gonyklisia, see pages 35 and 44 below, also Appendices B and C.

(2) Folios 55, 59, 63v, 73, 77v, 81, 82v, 123v, 125v, 130, 164, 178, 180, 181.

(3) Folios 69, 85v, 104v, 165, 166.

(4) Folios 68v, 80, 119, 121v.

(5) Folio 71.

(6) Folio 213v.

(7) Σήμερον συνέχει τάφος and the two following stichera are attributed to Theophanes without further qualification in Vatopedi 1488 (folio 121 verso), to Theophanes Protothronos in Laura Γ. 72 (folio 39). On this poet-composer, see *Specimina*, Pars suppletoria, p. 11 and note 28. Theophanes Graptos is believed to have modeled his poetry entirely on pre-existing melodies.

(8) Appendix A, No. 4, 7, 16, 39, 63, 66, 69, 77, 88, and the "canonical" stichera Ὁρῶσά σε ἡ κτίσις (folio 41 verso), Σήμερον ὁ ἀπρόσιτος (folio 42), and Δεῦτε λαοί (folio 172). To these ought perhaps to be added Appendix A, No. 33 (text by Leo), 119 (adapted from a Staurotheotokion by Leo) and 11 (related to a Staurotheotokion by Leo, for which it may perhaps have served as point of departure).

although it contains a number of pieces elsewhere attributed to him, while Laura Γ. 67, by far the richest of the three in compositions of this kind, attributes only four to their presumed author and for one of these the attribution has been entered in the margin (9). In themselves, these similarities scarcely warrant our assuming the three manuscripts to be closely related, but as our inquiry proceeds we shall discover further evidence of this sort, all of it pointing unmistakably in the same direction.

THE STICHERA APOCRYPHA

Even after the contents and arrangement of the Sticherarion had been normalized, stichera excluded from the normal contents were often entered, sometimes in place among the accepted pieces, sometimes collected at the back of the book or at the end of one or more of its sections. As a rule one finds only a few such pieces, but some copies contain a great many of them, and when this happens they may be distinguished marginally as "apocrypha" (ἀπόκρυφα, usually abbreviated ἀπό). One of our earliest sources, the tenth-century Heirmologion Patmos 55, already distinguishes in this way certain Akolouthiai that its scribe regarded as unusual or obsolete; with the Sticherarion the distinction seems not to have been introduced until the twelfth century, after normalization had already taken place. Particularly rich in pieces of this kind, more or less consistently distinguished, are the Coislin Sticheraria Patmos 218 (1) and Berlin Staatsbibliothek, cod. gr. fol. 49 (2), and to these

(9) Ἰησοῦς ὁ θεός (folio 36 verso), Σήμερον ὁ δόξη (Appendix A, No. 66), Μαθηταῖς τὸ πνεῦμα (folio 101) and Ἡ ἐκκλησία (folio 105).

(1) Johannes Sakkelion, Πατμιακὴ βιβλιοθήκη (Athens, 1890), p. 119; Kirsopp Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, I (Boston, 1934), 16-17; Floros, *op. cit.*, I, 60-61; Athanasius D. Komines, *Facsimiles of Dated Patmian Codices* (Athens, 1970), p. 25. There are facsimiles in Lake, *op. cit.*, I, pl. 49-51; *Specimina*, Pars principalis, pl. 113-115; Floros, *op. cit.*, III, pl. 67-72; *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, XXVII (1973), pl. 4 following p. 8. The manuscript is dated 1166 and, as its colophon indicates, it was not written on Patmos.

(2) *Die Handschriften Verzeichnisse der K. Bibliothek zu Berlin.* XI, 2. Verzeichniss der griechischen Handschriften, von C. de Boor (Berlin, 1897), 157-158. There are facsimiles in Johannes Wolf's *Handbuch der Notationskunde*, I (Leip-

may be added two copies in Middle Byzantine notation, Sinai 1216 and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, gr. 265. Still another example is the Coislin Triodion Sinai 1241 (3), although here, when one of its many apocrypha has a marginal comment, the designation used is ξένον ("strange" or "unfamiliar").

Until the twelfth century, then, the compilers of sticheraria seem not to have recognized the concept "apocryphon", and Vatopedi 1488 is no exception to the rule. If we wished to draw up a list of the pieces it includes which later compilers, had they included them, might have so labeled, we could begin by collecting the pieces in Chartres notation, disregarding the Oktoechos, for which the Chartres notation is used throughout. And if we were to follow this procedure, we would find that many of the pieces on our list were in fact regarded as apocrypha by the compilers of Patmos 218 and Berlin fol. 49. The result, however, would be more or less misleading, not only because our list would necessarily omit all Coislin stichera later excluded from the normal contents, but also because it would include a considerable number of pieces later excluded from that contents, not as unusual or obsolete, but as too familiar to require further copying or as not properly germane to the Sticherarion. Thus our only recourse will be to consider apocryphal all pieces included in Vatopedi 1488 but later excluded from the normal contents as no longer in general use, disregarding at the same time all those excluded for other reasons—the heirmoi and troparia of the Good Friday triodion and, in so far as they continued to be sung after normalization had taken place, the Theotokia of the Passion antiphons and the stichera of the Easter office. Familiar stichera found in unfamiliar contexts (4) we may safely omit, but we shall need to include the Staurotheotokia, for even in normal copies the pieces of this class are decidedly unstable.

zig, 1913), pl. facing p. 80, and *Musikalische Schrifttafeln* (Bückeburg, 1927), pl. 11; *Specimina*, Pars principalis, pl. 173-175. See also below, p. 42 and note 6.

(3) V. N. Beneševič, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum qui in monasterio Sanctae Catharinae in Monte Sina asservantur*, III, 1 (Hildesheim, 1965=Petrograd, 1917), 6. There are facsimiles in *Specimina*, Pars principalis, pl. 153-156. See also below, p. 32.

(4) For example, the Anatolikon Πορευθέντος σου (folio 201) is found also on folio 124 verso, with another refrain, as an idiomelon for the office of Holy Saturday.

Drawn up in accordance with the procedures outlined, our list of the stichera apocrypha contained in Vatopedi 1488 runs to 131 items, 118 of them with Chartres notation, 8 with Coislin notation, and 5 without notation of any kind. The list itself will be found printed as Appendix A, where one will find also a table of concordances locating the occurrences of the greater number of these pieces in the sources that have proved most productive—the two Chartres Triodia at the Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72, the three Coislin manuscripts already singled out as particularly rich in apocrypha (Patmos 218, Berlin fol. 49, and Sinai 1241), and the Palaeoslavonic Triodion Chilandari 307, published in the Monumenta's principal series as Volume V-A, a manuscript containing upwards of 65 apocrypha, their original Greek melodies adapted to Slavic translations of their original Greek texts.

Even though the two Chartres Triodia at the Laura are both of them fragmentary, Γ. 67 beginning from the fourth Wednesday in Lent, Γ. 72 from Monday in Holy Week (5), it was a foregone conclusion that they would yield many more concordances than any of the other sources collated. Yet it would be a mistake to conclude that either of them served the compiler of Vatopedi 1488 as a *Vorlage*. Our scribe is altogether too independent for this to have been the case. Not only does he include, in Chartres notation, a number of apocrypha for which neither Laura manuscript can have been the source, he often fails to follow them, for example in his provisions for Easter Sunday (6). Likewise independent, as we shall see, is his numbering of the Sundays in Lent.

(5) For the six folios removed from Γ. 67 by Paul Durand in 1840 and presented by him to the Bibliothèque municipale in Chartres, their destruction in May 1944 as the result of a bombardment, their description in 1907 by Amédée Gastoué, with one opening in facsimile, and the preservation of the rest by H. J. W. Tillyard in photographs or hand-written copies, see my "H. J. W. Tillyard and the Recovery of a Lost Fragment," *Studies in Eastern Chant*, I (London, 1966), 95-103; Γ. 72 has lost folios 44 and 45, with a part of the office for Easter Week. Floros (*op. cit.*, I, 53) draws attention to the marginal note on folio 59 verso, according to which the manuscript originally contained 86 stichera for Easter Week, and the heading on folio 40 indicates that this figure includes the stichera for the Vespers of Holy Saturday. There remain only 82, of which the one immediately preceding the lost folios breaks off before the end.

Collation with the three Coislin manuscripts we have chosen to consult leads to an entirely different result. It is not only that these sources yield relatively few concordances—the few that they do yield are largely confined to the first ten weeks of the Triodion. Once Lent proper is at an end, they are only sporadically in agreement with our manuscript, and when they are, it is usually because they contain the same Staurotheotokia and certain of the same Easter apocrypha, pieces to be found as readily in any number of other sources, early and late. Only too evident from our table is the frequent agreement of Patmos 218 with Berlin fol. 49 and the persistence with which Sinai 1241 fails to agree with either of these sources. No one of the three can possibly have served as a *Vorlage* for our manuscript, for to assume the contrary would leave us asking why the compiler of Vatopedi 1488, who prefers to follow his Coislin *Vorlage* whenever he can do so, has used the Chartres notation for so many of the apocrypha they contain. It remains to be said that concordances for a few further items on our list are to be found in other Coislin sources—notably in the Sinai Triodia 1242 and 1243 and in the Sticheraria Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, theol. gr. 136 and Ochrida 53. And since the divergent numbering of the Sundays in Lent, as found in Vatopedi 1488, derives in all probability from its Coislin *Vorlage*, it may be added that the same divergent numbering is found also in Berlin fol. 49, in Sinai 1243, and in Ochrida 53 (7).

Among the various concordances with Coislin sources, it will be useful to distinguish between those for which Vatopedi 1488 uses the Chartres notation and those for which it uses the Coislin. Where it uses the Chartres notation, these concordances may tell us something about our manuscript's repertory, but it is only when Coislin is concordant with Coislin that they may also tell us something about its principal *Vorlage*. On turning to the table in Appendix A, we shall

(6) See my "Further Note on the Proper Hymns for Easter," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, XXII (1961), 176-181, hereinafter cited as "A Further Note."

(7) The Sunday of the Cheese Fast, or Expulsion of Adam, is evidently reckoned as the first Sunday in Lent, for the following week-days are said to be "of the first week" and Orthodoxy Sunday is specifically referred to (folio 25 verso) as the second Sunday.

find that a significant number of our apocrypha in Chartres notation can be assigned to the Emperor Leo VI on the strength of the Coislin concordances reported there, and on considering then the probable provenance of the several Coislin sources consulted, we can only conclude that the majority are almost certainly from Constantinople, either because of their frequent attributions to the Emperor or because of their treatment of the office for St. Stephen, the bulk of which is transferred from December 27, the usual Byzantine date, to August 2, the date on which the translation of his relics to the imperial city is commemorated (8). Having reached this point, and having found that our manuscript's repertory has a distinctly Constantinopolitan tinge, we may now go on to ask whether Constantinople is not also the place where its principal *Vorlage* was drawn up. This appears to have been the case. Perhaps the least familiar of the apocrypha for which Vatopedi 1488 uses the Coislin notation are Ὁ ἐν βρωτοῖς πρῶτος κλασθείς (No. 4, for the Expulsion of Adam) and Τοῦ φρενοβλαβοῦς ἄνακτος (No. 7, for the Saturday of Theodore). Sinai 1241 is the one manuscript known to contain them both. This extraordinary source, which can only have been copied in Constantinople, contains no less than eighty-four apocrypha explicitly attributed to the Emperor, and among them are the two pieces on which our argument turns.

Wholly different in character is our last set of concordances, those with the Palaeoslavonic Triodion Chilandari 307. This peripheral source, ultimately derived from Byzantine Triodia in Archaic Coislin, can tell us nothing about our manuscript's *Vorlagen*, but what it tells us about its repertory is uncommonly revealing. Here and there it provides us with our only concordance, and when it is also concordant with other sources consulted, it is almost invariably concordant with one or both of the Laura Triodia. Only too evidently, some part of our manuscript's apocryphal repertory was in earlier times more widely known than might at first have been suspected. No better example of this could be adduced than the three troparia Vatopedi 1488 prescribes for the se-

(8) Thus, for example, in Sinai 1217 (the first part of Sinai 1243), Vienna, theol. gr. 136, and Ochrida 53. In the "Codex Dalassenos" the entire office for St. Stephen has been entered at the end of the manuscript.

cond antiphon of the Pedilavium—Ὁ νίψας τοὺς πόδας (No. 57) and its two contrafacta. That these pieces had reached Southern Italy by the early twelfth century follows from their inclusion in Vaticanus graecus 771, a text of the Triodion copied at Grottaferrata, perhaps by the Sophronius who completed his copy of the January Menaion in December 1101 (9). But from Chilandari 307 we learn that they were known also, and perhaps even earlier, in the region of Novgorod, and here they are followed by four additional stanzas to be sung to the same melody. The original Greek texts of these and other additional stanzas may be found in Sinai 735, a text of the Triodion copied in Jerusalem, as it appears (10), and it is presumably in Jerusalem that the ultimate origin of the entire series is to be sought.

Of the two *Vorlagen* that underlie the Triodion Vatopedi 1488, our study of the list of apocrypha with its table of concordances has already led us to infer the probable Constantinopolitan origin of the one, a Coislin copy without Oktoechos. It ought to have taught us also that the other, in Chartres notation, can only have been produced on Mount Athos. For despite the disagreements between the two Laura Triodia on the one hand, and between either of them and the Vatopedi Triodion on the other, the three manuscripts have far too much in common to permit a different conclusion. This claim is amply supported by our table of concordances; it will be still more amply supported in what follows. And from our table we may draw one further conclusion: twenty-two of our apocrypha are found only in Vatopedi 1488 and among

(9) Riccardo Maisano, *Il Codice Vat. gr. 771* (typewritten thesis for the Laurea, University of Rome, 1968-1969), p. 6-8.

(10) Victor Gardthausen, *Catalogus codium graecorum Sinaiticorum* (Oxford, 1886), p. 160, where the manuscript is assigned to the tenth century. It includes two distinct orders of service for the Pedilavium (folios 170 verso to 175, folios 175 to 178). The first of these introduces Ὁ νίψας τοὺς πόδας with ten troparia, the second involves the participation of a patriarch. Considering the close ties that have bound St. Catherine's to the Jerusalem Patriarchate, considering also that the autonomous Archbishop of Sinai has frequently been consecrated by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, one can scarcely doubt that it was from Jerusalem that Sinai 735 came to St. Catherine's. Add to this that Ὁ νίψας τοὺς πόδας is found also on page 113 of the edition of the fragmentary Jerusalem Typikon of 1122 published by Papadopoulos-Kerameus in his Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, II (St. Petersburg, 1894), 1-254.

these twenty-two are three it attributes to Cosmas—Τοὺς ἀγραμμάτους μαθητάς (No. 109, Pentecost) with its two contrafacta (11).

ARRANGEMENT OF THE SINGLE OFFICES

How does our compiler go about combining what he finds in his two *Vorlagen* so as to give to the single offices of his composite Triodion a semblance of order? In certain sections of the book the stichera and troparia are invariably arranged in the order of their performance (1), and since there is little if any variation in the make-up of these sections, they create no problem for him or for us. For the rest, one's first impression may be that he proceeds quite arbitrarily and almost at random, turning from the one *Vorlage* to the other without any immediately discernible plan, now observing the order of the modal cycle, now disregarding it. Yet when one looks attentively at the arrangement of those offices that are fully rubricated (2), a pattern begins to emerge and our compiler's intention becomes evident. Always preferring the Coislin notation to the Chartres when a choice presents itself, he seeks to accommodate the combined contents of his *Vorlagen* to the needs of his own community. First he enters the stichera the community actually sings in the order in which they will actually be sung; then he enters the remainder of what he finds in the order of the modal cycle. To put it differently, his arrangement of the single offices is governed by two mutually exclusive principles, the liturgical and the modal, first by the one, then by the other. As to the offices that are without rubrication, these also begin by disregarding the order of the modal cycle and conclude by observing it, even when—as sometimes happens—all entries are drawn

(11) Strictly speaking, the model stanza cannot qualify as an apocryphon, for its text is printed in the Parakletike (Rome ed., p. 325) as an Apostolikon for the Wednesday Vespers of the Tetartos. So far as my own experience goes, however, Vatopedi 1488 is the only source to contain both text and music, as it is also the only one to contain the two troparia and the ascription to Cosmas.

(1) See above, page 5.

(2) Fully rubricated are the offices from the Saturday of Lazarus through Antipascha (folios 55 to 135), also those for Mid-Pentecost, Ascension, and Pentecost (folios 140, 154, and 164).

(3) Thus in the offices for the Sundays of the Nicaean Fathers and All Saints (folios 162 and 173 verso).

from the Coislin *Vorlage* (3). It should be safe to assume that they too are to be understood in the same way.

THE PEDILAVIUM

Following its provisions for the Orthros and Vespers of Maundy Thursday, the Triodion Vatopedi 1488 continues with those for the Pedilavium (ὁ νιπτήρ), the ceremony commemorating the washing of the feet of the disciples (1), and for this ceremony it supplies detailed directions not unlike those one might expect to find in an Euchologion or a Typikon. Comparable directions can be found also in many other sources, and from these it appears that the actual conduct of the ceremony varied widely from one community to another. Its stable features comprise the chanting of a proper litany, the recitation of three prayers, and the reading of the gospel account of the events commemorated (John 13.3 to 17), divided into two sections, the first of which (verses 3 to 11) deals with the action itself, the second (verses 12 to 17) with the mandate to the disciples after the action had been completed. During the reading of the first of these two sections, the participants join in a symbolic, quasi-dramatic enactment of the narration. Beyond this, however, local usage takes over. Not even the choice of prayers is constant, and there are drastic differences in the choice, number, and arrangement of the troparia.

Detailed directions for the ceremony are found also in Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72 (2), and save for insignificant variations in wording, they are identical with those found in Vatopedi 1488. All three provide that the officiant may be a priest, a monk, or a layman;

(1) Jacobus Goar, *Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecorum* (Graz, 1960=Venice, 1730), p. 591-596; Dmitrievskij, I, 546-549 (Typikon of the Theotokos Euergetes, Athens, National Library 788, 11th/12th century, including Ὁ νίψας τοὺς πόδας with three troparia); 879-880 (Typikon of S. Maria di Mili, Sicily, Vat. gr. 1877, dated 1292); 910 (Excerpts from the Typikon of Grottaferrata, Γ.α.i, dated 1300); Arranz, *Le Typikon*, p. 234–235 (Typikon di S. Salvatore di Messina). No two of these orders can be said to agree and none agrees with the orders summarized in Table 2 below. In particular, the two Sicilian typika envisage the ceremony as forming part of the Vespers, interpolating it between the ordinary psalm, with its stichera, and the Old Testament lessons, with their prokeimenon.

(2) Γ. 67, folios 38 verso to 42; Γ. 72, folios 11 verso to 16.

if he be a priest, the ceremony is to take place at Vespers after the ordinary psalm or Κύριε ἐκέκραξα; if he be a monk or a layman, it is to take place in the narthex after the dismissal. All three direct that, before girding himself with the towel, the officiant, if a

TABLE 2

			Laura Γ. 72	Laura Γ. 67
		Ἀντίφωνον α΄		
1	β	Ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος Μακάριοι οἱ ἄμωμοι (Ps. 118.1)	12	38v
2	β	Ἐν τῷ νιπτῆρι Μακάριοι οἱ ἐξερευνῶντες (Ps. 118.2)	12	38v
3	β	Μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα Δόξα καὶ νῦν	12	38v
		Τὴν πᾶσαν ἐλπίδα (Theotokion)	*12*	*38v*
		Ἀντίφωνον β΄		
4	β	Μεγάλης εὐεργεσίας Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι (Ps. 118.3)	12v	38v
5	β	Ὁ πέτρος ηὐλαβεῖτο Σὺ ἐνετείλω (Ps. 118.4)	12v	39
6	β	Ὁ νίψας τοὺς πόδας Δόξα καὶ νῦν	13	39v
		Χαῖρε μαρία θεοτόκε (Theotokion)	*13*	*39v*
		Ἀντίφωνον γ΄· Ὠδὴ ε΄		
7	πλ β	Τῷ συνδέσμῳ Τότε οὐ μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῶ (Ps. 118.6)	13	*39v*
8	πλ β	Ἡ τὸ ἄσχετον Ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι (Ps. 118.7)	13	*39v*
9	πλ β	Μαθηταῖς ὑποδεικνύει Δόξα καὶ νῦν	13v	*39v*
		Μονογενὲς ὁμοούσιε (Theotokion)	*13v*	*39v*
		Proper litany		
		Three prayers		
		Κύριε ὑπεράγαθε Δέσποτα κύριε τῆς δόξης Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν		

[Table 2, continued]

			Laura Γ. 72	Laura Γ. 67
		Gospel (John, 13.3 to 11)		
		Ἀντίφωνον α΄		
10	α	Ὁ λεντίῳ ζωσάμενος Ἐλέησόν με ὁ θεός (Ps. 50.3)	14	40
11	α	Ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων Ἐπὶ πλεῖον πλῦνόν με (Ps. 50.4)	14	40
12	α	Τὰ τάγματα Δόξα καὶ νῦν	14v	40v
		Χαῖρε θεοτόκε παρθένε (Theotokion)	*14v*	*40v*
		Ἀντίφωνον β΄		
13	πλ δ	Σήμερον ὁ ἀπρόσιτος Ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς (Ps. 50.6b)	14v	40v
14	πλ δ	Οὐκ ἔστιν ὅμοιός σοι Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις (Ps. 50.7)	15	41
15	πλ δ	Τίς λαλήσει	15v	41v
		Gospel (John 13.12 to 17)		
		Ὠδὴ ς΄ πρὸς Ἄβυσσος ἐσχάτη		
16	πλ β	Κύριον φωνεῖτε Ῥαντιεῖς με ὑσσώπῳ (Ps. 50.9)	15v	*41v*
		Ὠδὴ ε΄ πρὸς Πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω		
17	πλ β	Ῥυφθέντες πόδας Δόξα καὶ νῦν	16	*42*
		Μεγάλων χαρισμάτων (Theotokion)	*16*	*42*

priest, shall lay aside his phelonion or chasuble; if a monk, his mandyan or cloak; if a layman, his himation or outer garment; that the lowest-ranking participant is to be the first to approach; that at the end of the ceremony, as they bear the basin from the church, the monks are to sprinkle the congregation with its water. They have the same proper litany, and their choice of prayers is the same. The full text of the directions provided by Vatopedi 1488, transcribed by Miss Follieri, will be found as Appendix B. The choice, number, and arrangement of its troparia differ here

and there from those of Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72. These, in turn, are in full agreement with one another, and as a convenience to the reader I insert at this point a list of their provisions. As in other such tables, folio numbers in italics indicate the absence of musical notation. (For the table see pp. 36–37).

To recognize the affinity of these provisions with those of Vatopedi 1488, one has only to compare them with Appendix B or with the facsimile itself (folios 84 verso to 98 verso). The differences affect only the troparia numbered 4 to 6 and 13 to 15. Troparia 7, 8, 9, 16, and 17 are by Cosmas of Maiouma, the first four from his canon for Maundy Thursday, the fifth from his Good Friday triodion. Of the seventeen troparia of the Laura list, only four (4, 5, 10, and 13) survived the normalization of the Sticherarion. Our compiler, having found them in his Coislin *Vorlage*, enters them in Coislin notation, Troparion 10 at the head of the antiphon that follows the first reading from the Gospel, the remainder (4, 5, and 13) at the end of the office, with the rubric Ἕτερα στιχηρὰ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα. Significantly enough, Troparia 14 and 15 of the Laura list are not included among these "other stichera".

Added to what we already know, our examination of this one thoroughly exceptional office settles the question of the mutual relationship of our three principal sources and all but clears up the question of their provenance. In this particular case, two of them make virtually identical provisions, to which those of the third are strikingly similar. Two of them, then, must have been intended for the use of a single community, with which the community for whose use the third was intended must have had much in common. That Γ. 72 was compiled at the Great Laura on Mount Athos cannot be doubted (3); it follows, accordingly, that Γ. 67 was compiled there also (4). That Vatopedi 1488 was likewise compiled on Mount Athos has already been suggested; it now appears certain that this was the case (5). In all probability it was compiled at the

(3) *Specimina*, Pars suppletoria, p. 9-11.

(4) Taking a different view, Floros (*op. cit.*, I, 84) holds that "All signs point to Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, as the place where the manuscript originated."

(5) The view that the two Laura Triodia are intimately related, with Vatopedi 1488 not far removed, finds further support in their provisions for Easter Week, which I have already examined in another connection ("A Further

monastery where it is preserved today and where it has been preserved for centuries. Whatever its provenance, however, its Chartres *Vorlage* must have had the same origin. We have already seen that our compiler includes, in Chartres notation, many apocrypha for which neither Laura manuscript can have been the source. To this we may now add that he regularly enters his Chartres apocrypha among the pieces that follow the order of the service; never indeed does one find such a piece in the appendix-like supplements in which the entries follow the order of the modal cycle.

The compiler of Vatopedi 1488 was an ultra-conservative scribe who included whatever he found in his *Vorlagen*, without regard to its usefulness or lack of it. Thus, if he did not enter Troparia 14 and 15 of the Laura list among his provisions for the Pedilavium or among the "other stichera" that follow them, beyond inferring that he did not need these pieces, we may also infer that he did not find them in his *Vorlagen*. He may not even have known them.

Note"), and in the Old Testament lessons they appoint for the Good Friday hours. All three depart to some extent from what Høeg and Zuntz, in their edition of the *Prophetologium* (Fasciculus quartus, Copenhagen, 1960), have called the "Usus classicus.". A simple tabulation will make this clear.

	"Usus classicus"	Γ. 67 and Γ. 72	Vatopedi 1488
Prime	Zechariah, 11.11	Zechariah, 11.10	*Isaiah (!) =Jeremiah, 11.18
Tierce	Isaiah, 50.4	*Isaiah (!) =Jeremiah, 11.18	Isaiah, 52.13
Sext	Isaiah, 52.13	Isaiah, 52.13	Zechariah, 11.10
None	Jeremiah, 11.18	*Jeremiah (!) =Isaiah, 50.4	Isaiah, 50.4

The choice of lessons remains the same, but in the two Laura Triodia two of the four lessons have changed places, while in Vatopedi not one is where it belongs. Nor is this all. Vatopedi mistakenly attributes the lesson from Jeremiah to Isaiah, a mistake found also in other sources, among them Γ. 67 and Γ. 72. But not previously recorded, so far as I can discover, is the further misattribution of the Laura Triodia, which agree in naming Jeremiah as the author of Isaiah 50.4, a bit of circumstantial evidence not easily dismissed as pure coincidence.

THE THEOTOKIA OF THE PASSION ANTIPHONS

That the virtual unanimity of the provisions for the Pedilavium found in our three principal sources should extend also to the Theotokia following the several antiphons is perhaps the most compelling reason for inferring their close dependence upon one another, for the Theotokia, as a class, are by their very nature unstable. Troparia in praise of the Virgin or asking Her intercession, sung in connection with a doxology or, when this is divided into two clauses, in connection with its second clause, they adapt themselves as readily to one context as to another, provided only that they maintain the mode of the preceding troparia, or at least that of the last troparion to precede.

Nowhere is this more strikingly illustrated than in the office of the Holy Sufferings. Fifteen antiphons, with verses from the Psalter, are sung at this service, and after a doxology each of these antiphons concludes with a Theotokion, chosen as a rule from among the more familiar Theotokia of the mode. In later copies these Theotokia are seldom specifically mentioned; earlier ones frequently supply their texts or text-incipits, rarely their music. Yet in determining which Theotokia were to be sung, and where, the individual scribes appear to have been free to choose almost as they pleased. No two sources call for exactly the same Theotokia in exactly the same order, and if those for Antiphons 1 to 9 are relatively stable, those for Antiphons 10 to 15 could scarcely be less so. To deal with this staggering variety in all its detail would lead us far afield; suffice it to say that, beyond appointing a Theotokion for each antiphon, Patmos 218 and Sinai 1241 appoint a number of alternates, largely Staurotheotokia drawn from the canons of the Oktoechos, and this without once agreeing in their choice.

These observations apply with equal force to the provisions of our three principal sources, in other respects so intimately related. For the first three groups of antiphons (1 to 9) they are almost completely in accord. From here on, however, each goes its own way, and for Antiphons 10 to 14 Γ. 67 appoints alternates, entering their incipits in the margin. (See the table on p. 41.)

Slender as it is, our table is still broad enough to suggest the degree of variety we would encounter if we were to extend the comparison further. It will serve also to support the view, previ-

TABLE 3

		Vatopedi 1488		Laura Γ. 72		Laura Γ. 67	
1	πλ δ	Παρθενος ετεκες	91	Παρθενος ετεκες	17	Παρθενος ετεκες	*42*v
2	πλ β	Ον ετεκες	91v	Ον ετεκες	17v	Ον ετεκες	*43*
3	β	Διασωσον	92v	Οτι ουκ εχομεν	18	Διασωσον	*44*
				Διασωσον	18		
4	α	Δεδοξασμενα	93v	Δεδοξασμενα	*19*	Δεδοξασμενα	*45*
5	πλ β	Η αρρητως	94	Η αρρητως	19v	Η αρρητως	*45*v
6	βαρυς	Χαιρε θεοτοκε	*95*	Χαιρε θεοτοκε	*20*v	Χαιρε θεοτοκε	*46*v
7	πλ δ	Ως πυλην	96	Ως πυλην	*21*	Ως πυλην	*47*
8	β	Οτι ουκ εχομεν	*96*v	Οτι ουκ εχομεν	*21*v	Οτι ουκ εχομεν	*48*
9	γ	Οι εξ εθνων	97	Οι εξ εθνων	22	Οι εξ εθνων	*48*
10	πλ β	Ειρηνευσον	98	Ο την ευλογημενην	22v	Ειρηνευσον	*49*
						Η το χαιρε	*49*
11	πλ β	Η το χαιρε	99	Θεον εκ σου	*23*	Θεον εκ σου	*49*v
						Ον ετεκες	*49*v
12	πλ δ	Ο δι'ημας	*100*	Ο δι'ημας	*24*	Ο δι'ημας	*50*v
						Χαιρε η πυλη	*50*v
13	πλ β	Ο την ευλογημενην	*100*v	Ειρηνευσον	25	Ο την ευλογημενην	*51*v
						Ειρηνευσον	*51*v
14	πλ δ	Φυσεως τους ορους	101	Ο βασιλευς	*25*v	Χαιρε η πυλη	*51*v
						Χαιρε η δι' αγγελου	*51*v
15	πλ β	Ορωσα σε	102	Ορωσα σε	26	Ορωσα σε	52

ously expressed, that the Theotokia involved are as a rule familiar ones. Of the fifteen our manuscript appoints, four (6, 8 (1), 12, and 13 (2)) are troparia in the narrower sense; two of these (12 and 13) are more usually associated with the Apolytikia Anastasima, the troparia sung at the dismissal of the Saturday Vespers and with the Θεὸς κύριος at the Sunday Orthros. ʽΗ τὸ χαῖρε δι 'ἀγγέλου (11) is itself a heirmos (3) and the model for ʽΗ ἀῤῥήτως ἐπ' ἐσχάτων (5) and for Θεοτόκε ἡ τεκοῦσα, the Theotokion coupled with Antiphon 13 in all three of our Coislin controls; also modeled on

(1) Horologion (Grottaferrata ed.), p. 811, 191.
(2) Parakletike (Rome ed.), p. 618, 452.
(3) Iviron 470 (*Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*, Série principale, II), folio 105 verso.

heirmoi are Vatopedi's Theotokia 1, 2, and 4 (4). Ὁρῶσά σε κρεμάμενον (15) is based on the well-known sticheron automelon Τριήμερος ἀνέστης (5); this Anastasimon is the model for more than fifty prosomoia printed in current editions of the office books, as also for numerous Theotokia and Staurotheotokia, among them Μεγάλων χαρισμάτων, already encountered in connection with the Pedilavium.

Singularly inept is the treatment of Antiphon 14 in Vatopedi 1488. The Theotokion Φύσεως τοὺς ὅρους belongs to a closed set expressly contrived for this office, each one of the fifteen a contrafactum modeled on the final troparion of its antiphon. Doubtless younger than the troparia themselves, these pieces are never found in normal copies of the Triodion. In their day, however, they appear to have been widely known: aside from their inclusion in Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72, one finds them, with their melodies, in the Euchologion Grottaferrata Γ. β. xxxv, from Southern Italy, possibly from Messina; in Berlin fol. 49, from the region of Phocis in central Greece (6); and in Chilandari 307, from the region of Novgorod; without their melodies they are found also in Patmos 218. In Chilandari 307 they precede the doxologies, which are then followed by Theotokia of the usual sort; in Laura Γ. 72 they follow the doxologies, with the Theotokia of our list as alternates; in Berlin fol. 49 the doxologies are divided into two clauses, with the contrafacta following the first clause and Theotokia of the usual sort following the second. But in Vatopedi 1488 one finds only Φύσεως τοὺς ὅρους, a contrafactum of the final troparion of Antiphon 7, Τρίτον ἀρνησάμενος; for Antiphon 14 the appropriate contrafactum would have been Πικρὰν ὀδύνην ἔσχεν, modeled on the troparion Μικρὸν φωνὴν ἀφῆκεν. Φύσεως τοὺς ὅρους agrees only in mode.

As our table shows, Γ. 67 leaves its Theotokia without notation, excepting only Ὁρῶσά σε, the last of its series. Vatopedi 1488 and

---

(4) *Ibid.*, Οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος, folio 135; Οἱ ὅσιοί σου παῖδες, folio 107; Τῷ βοηθήσαντι θεῷ, folio 18.

(5) Parakletike (Rome ed.), p. 466.

(6) From the neighborhood of Delphi. Under February 7 it contains an office for Hosios Loukas, the tenth-century ascetic over whose tomb disciples built the monastery near Delphi that bears his name; under July 9 it contains an office for the Five Martyrs of Leodorikion, the modern Lidhorikion, some twenty miles from Delphi.

Laura Γ. 72, on the other hand, conserve many of these important melodies, and since they occasionally compensate for one another's deficiencies, we have nearly all of them. We are thus in a position to control the versions found in those exceptional later sources that contain them, and on comparing these Middle Byzantine versions with those in the earlier notation, we can recognize as at least distantly related those of Sinai 1216, a manuscript of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, and as unmistakably spurious those of the fifteenth-century Sticherarion Sinai 1226 (7). Particularly valuable are the early notations for Ὁρῶσά σε, for these provide us with controls for the versions of the model melody, Τριήμερος ἀνέστης, that begin to appear in those fourteenth-century sources that contain the Stichera Anastasima. For the melody of this exceptional Theotokion, Vatopedi 1488 uses the Coislin notation, adding a further detail to what we already know about our manuscript's Coislin *Vorlage* (8).

---

(7) See above, p. 9, note 13.

(8) The third Chartres Triodion at the Laura, Γ. 12, omits both the Pedilavium and the office of the Holy Passions; it must have been expected that these omissions would be supplied from another book, perhaps a copy of the Euchologion. Even so, in its provisions for the Good Friday hours, it provides a basis of comparison that will enable us to judge just how closely or how remotely it agrees with the Laura use as we know it from our examination of Γ. 67 and Γ. 72. To begin with the Old Testament lessons it appoints, Γ. 12 conforms to the "Usus classicus" rather than to the divergent order of the Laura use with its misattributions (page 38–39 above, note 5). And there are other differences, all pointing in the same direction. At Prime, for example, Γ. 12 at first called only for Psalm 5, for the marginal reference to Psalm 75 is an afterthought; as is the rule for all hour services, Γ. 67 and Γ. 72 call for three psalms—in this case Psalms 2, 5, and 40. In a similar way, the prokeimena preceding the Old Testament lesson differ, with Γ. 12 drawing its refrain and verse from Psalm 37, as opposed to the Laura use, which draws on Psalm 40. Laura Γ. 12 makes no mention of the Kathisma Staurosimon or of its Theotokion; both elements are present in Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72. On the other hand, Laura Γ. 67 and Γ. 72 make no mention of a second prokeimenon or of a second Epistle; whether these are to be understood as alternates or as the result of a conflation, seemingly superfluous provisions of this kind are a characteristic feature of Laura Γ. 12, not only at Prime, but also at the other hours. Laura Γ. 12 is an immensely valuable source and a highly interesting one, but it has no real bearing on our problem. Liturgically, it is altogether incompatible with the Laura use or with the related use of Vatopedi 1488. And yet, after having disposed of Laura Γ. 67 as a Constantinopolitan product, Floros

THE GONYKLISIA

In the Orthodox East, where Sundays are regarded as commemorations of the Resurrection, the rule has been that on that day, that is, from the Saturday Vespers until the Sunday Vespers, there is to be no kneeling during the services; by extension this rule is applied also to the entire season Easter to Pentecost. But with the celebration of the Divine Liturgy on the feast of Pentecost the Easter season is at an end, and when kneeling is resumed at Vespers later in the day, its resumption is marked by a thoroughly exceptional order of service, the so-called Gonyklisia or office of genuflection (1). In our day the sole difference between this order and the monastic Vesper order followed at other times lies in the conspicuous place it gives to three elaborate prayers from the 'Ακολουθία ᾀσματική or "chanted" office, the order formerly followed at Hagia Sophia and other great public churches (2). In all probability, however, the monasteries began by admitting the whole of the "chanted" office on this one occasion, gradually modifying it as time went on by introducing more and more monastic elements until only the prayers were left. The two offices being inherently incompatible and frequently in conflict, attempts to combine them led inevitably to difficulties. These might be resolved in more than one way, and in consequence the arrangement of the Gonyklisia, like that of the Pedilavium, soon came to vary widely from one locality to another. The Euchologion Coislin 213 at the Bibliothèque Nationale, a manuscript from Hagia Sophia dated 1027, after setting forth the order for the Gonyklisia followed by the great public church of the capital, outlines five other ways of performing the

(*op. cit.*, I, 84) adds that "There is nothing to prevent our assuming that Γ. 12 [like Γ. 72] originated at the Laura." It would seem to me that there is everything to prevent it.

(1) On the office of genuflection in general, see Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 597-606; Pseudo-Kodinus, *Traité des offices* (Paris, 1966), p. 239; Arranz, *Le Typicon*, p. xlvi, 390; for the definitive order, the Rome edition of the Pentekostarion, p. 407-419.

(2) On the "chanted" office in general, see my "Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, IX/X* (1956), 175-202, with musical examples and bibliographical footnotes, also Juan Mateos, *Le Typicon de la grande église* (Rome, 1962-63).

service (3), and to these it would not be difficult to add as many more.

Of our three principal sources, only Vatopedi 1488 supplies detailed directions for the performance of the Gonyklisia; transcribed by Miss Follieri, these will be found as Appendix C. Unlike those given by the Messina Typikon (4), followed more or less closely by certain ultra-conservative manuscripts from Southern Italy (5), they adhere strictly to the monastic order until after the prokeimenon, at which point the mingling of the two orders begins. The prayers are to be read between the deacon's supplication (Εἴπωμεν πάντες) and the petitions (Πληρώσωμεν τὴν ἑσπερινὴν δέησιν). All three of them are composite: each begins with a proper prayer suited to the occasion and continues with one of the three prayers recited at Hagia Sophia on feast days, the prayers of the so-called "little" antiphons (6). After each of these our manuscript calls for the singing of the corresponding antiphon. The second antiphon carries with it the troparion 'Ο μονογενὴς υἱός and the Theotokion Τὴν ὑπερένδοξον; after the third antiphon follows the troparion of the day, Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Χριστέ. Then, following the deacon's petitions, comes a fourth prayer, coupled with the so-called prayer of dismissal (7). The three aposticha of the monastic office, sung in connection with verses from Psalm 50, together with their doxastikon, are reserved for the very end, just before the canticle of Symeon.

This solution cannot be said to agree exactly with any of those outlined by Coislin 213, and while it exhibits certain striking points of contact with the directions given by Sinai 966, a thirteenth-

(3) Dmitrievskij, II, 999-1001.

(4) Arranz, *Le Typicon*, p. 278-282.

(5) Grottaferrata, Γ. β. xxxv, folios 52 verso to 72 verso (for folios 52 verso to 57, see *Specimina*, pl. 38-42); Γ.γ.v. (dated 1225), folios 197 verso to 209; Biblioteca Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1606, folios 172 verso to 182; Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Ashburnham 64, folios 258 to 264 verso (*Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*, Série principale, IV).

(6) For the prayers of the "little" antiphons, see Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 35-36; "The Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia," p. 106-108.

(7) The prayers Σὸν γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς and 'Ο θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ὕψιστος (Pentekostarion, Rome, 1883, p. 415, line 19; ibid., p. 416). In some early sources, for example Sinai 956 and 959 (Dmitrievskij, II, 16 and 45), the designation "prayer of dismissal" is applied to both prayers, not simply to the second.

century Euchologion from Southern Italy (8), particularly in specifying that the prayers be read *mezza voce*, the correspondence again falls short of the ideal. The "little" antiphons are without notation in Vatopedi 1488; for their music—simple syllabic psalm-tones, sometimes with florid cadences—we most turn to those exceptional sources of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that illustrate the "chanted" Vespers of outstanding feasts (9). The troparia associated with them are likewise without notation, presumably because they were thought too familiar to require it. Even so, as concrete early evidence of the intermingling of the monastic and non-monastic on Mount Athos, the few folios that Vatopedi 1488 devotes to the Gonyklisia have their importance, for the Triodia at the Laura and our other concordant sources are content to enter the stichera required for the service, leaving us with no means of determining how these were to be combined with the prayers or whether the singing of the "little" antiphons and their troparia was contemplated.

THE OKTOECHOS AND ITS SUPPLEMENTS

Until now, the compiler of Vatopedi 1488 has used the Chartres notation only for apocrypha and other exceptional pieces, thus placing those interested in the Chartres notation at a decided disadvantage. As we have seen, most of these pieces are to be found only in Chartres sources, others are unique, few are preserved in Coislin notation, still fewer in Middle Byzantine. In consequence, despite the considerable interest of this part of its repertory, our manuscript has thus far provided very little material on which a first approach to the Chartres notation can be based.

With the Oktoechos, the situation changes completely. Here Vatopedi 1488 uses the Chartres notation throughout, but with very few exceptions it uses it to enter pieces that may be found in every Coislin and Middle Byzantine Sticherarion. Meticulously

(8) Dmitrievskij, II, 216-217.

(9) Athens, National Library, 2061 and 2062; Vatopedi 1527 (dated 1434); Laura E. 173 (dated 1436).

transcribed by Professor Tillyard, they may also be found in his two indispensable volumes for the Transcripta series. Thus, if the student of the early notations wishes to begin by identifying the Chartres equivalents of the more usual opening and cadential patterns of the several modes—and this would be the procedure recommended—he has ideal material readily at hand (1); thanks to its convenient arrangement and the equal distribution of its contents among the eight modes, the Oktoechos offers him the simplest and most economical means of doing so.

On comparing the Chartres version of the Oktoechos with Professor Tillyard's transcriptions, the reader will soon discover for himself that the two versions, Chartres and Middle Byzantine, are in general agreement. At the same time he will also encounter occasional disagreements, some confined to the melody (2), others to the text (3), still others affecting both. For an extreme example he need only turn to the Alphabetika for the letters Zeta and Xi (4). In all versions the two texts have three lines in common:

διό· καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς δοξάζουσι·
τὴν σὴν τριήμερον ἔγερσιν·
δώρησαι ἱλασμὸν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Yet in Alphabetikon Zeta the Chartres tradition has the continuation παραδείσου οἰκήτορας καταξιῶν· δι' ἄφατον ἔλεος, while in the Coislin and Middle Byzantine these lines conclude Alphabetikon Xi, with the variant ὡς μόνος εὔσπλαγχνος. On the other hand, in Alphabetikon Zeta the Coislin and Middle Byzantine traditions have the continuation καὶ τὸ μέγα ἔλεος, while in the Chartres this line concludes Alphabetikon Xi.

(1) Sooner or later he will wish also to consult a copy of the Coislin Oktoechos. I myself have usually relied upon Grottaferrata E. α. xi, dated 1113, a fragmentary Triodion with complete Oktoechos on folios 1, 4, 2, 7 to 21. For the Heothina from this manuscript, see my *Specimina*, pl. 69-72.

(2) For examples, see "The Antiphons of the Oktoechos," p. 62-64, Ex. 12-15.

(3) See, for example, the Anatolikon Ὄντως παράνομοι; the Middle Byzantine reading is σήμερον προῆλθεν τοῦ μνήματος· καὶ ἔλεγον (*Transcripta*, III, 21), the Chartres ὅπως ἐξανέστη ὁ κύριος· καὶ λέγεται (Vatopedi 1488, folio 183 verso, and Laura Γ. 67, folio 115, with the variant ἐξηγέρθη). The two readings are identical in syllable count and accent distribution.

(4) *Transcripta*, III, 115 and 128; Vatopedi 1488, folios 182 verso and 191.

In short, the texts of the two continuations exchange places, and since the Alphabetika Zeta and Xi do not belong to the same mode, each continuation has two independent musical settings. The Middle Byzantine tradition descends from the Coislin, not from the Chartres, and it is only when the Coislin and Chartres agree that the Middle Byzantine and Chartres will agree also.

With the Oktoechos we part company with Laura Γ. 72, for this manuscript ends with the office for the Sunday of All Saints. Vatopedi 1488 and Laura Γ. 67 are the only Chartres sources to contain the Oktoechos. They belong, of course, to the same tradition, textually and melodically, but in arrangement and content they often differ, not only from one another, but also from what we find in Coislin and Middle Byzantine Sticheraria.

In the course of our account of the normal Triodion, after having distinguished between the systematic and the cyclic arrangements of the Oktoechos, we held that until about the year 1250 the systematic arrangement was the one universally favored. The Chartres Oktoechos does not obey this rule. Vatopedi 1488 uses a mixed arrangement, with the Anatolika and Alphabetika of each mode in the order of performance, the Anabathmoi following as a separate collection; Laura Γ. 67, on the other hand, uses the cyclic arrangement with the Anabathmoi in place, preceding the Anatolika of the Sunday Orthros. And there are other differences. The Vatopedi copy omits the Anatolika of the Sunday Vespers and the Heothina; the Laura copy includes them, entering the Heothina in two distinct versions. In each mode, following the four Anatolika of the Saturday Vespers, the Laura copy enters two Theotokia; the Vatopedi copy omits them. Again in each mode, following the three Alphabetika, the Laura copy enters two sets of Theotokia, the familiar set with the acrostic Ἰωάννου· Ἀμήν, and a second, otherwise unfamiliar set with the same acrostic; here the Vatopedi copy is inconsistent, agreeing with the Laura copy's first set in seven modes, with the second in an eighth (5). Neither copy has a supplementary cycle of Dogmatika, yet the one at the Laura is exceptionally rich in Theotokia of this type, entered at the end

(5) Appendix A, No. 125.

of the single modes following the Anatolika of the Sunday Vespers. Nor has either copy a supplementary cycle of Staurotheotokia; both of them enter the Theotokia of this type in place within the Triodion proper under the days on which they were actually to be sung—the Wednesday of Mid-Lent, Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and the Sunday of the Women at the Tomb.

Almost unknown to the Coislin Oktoechos and its descendant, the Middle Byzantine, are the eight Theotokia designed to prepare the singing of the Gloria in excelsis (6), one of which is entered at the end of each of the modes in the Vatopedi copy, following immediately upon the final Anatolikon of the Sunday Orthros. Near counterparts of the Western introductory tropes, these pieces have as their common refrain the opening lines of the Gloria itself and take their refrain melody from the sticheron that prepares the singing of the Gloria at the Christmas Orthros—Σήμερον ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν Βηθλεέμ (7). With these eight Theotokia the corresponding cycle in the Laura copy has only four in common, while an incomplete third cycle in the Coislin Triodion Sinai 1243 agrees now with Vatopedi, now with the Laura, without adding anything new. (Table 4).

Since the Christmas sticheron whose refrain they quote belongs

TABLE 4

	Vatopedi 1488		Laura Γ. 67		Sinai 1243	
α	Παρεστωσα	181	Την τριημερον	110v	Παρεστωσα	130v
β	Ωσπερ της παρθενιας	184	Συν ταις αλλαις	115v	Συν ταις αλλαις	132v
γ	Παρθενικην	186v	Παρθενικην	120v	Παρθενικην	134
δ	Τι σου το ξενον	189v	Τι σου το ξενον	126	Τι σου το ξενον	135
πλ α	Ει και λιθος	193	Ει και λιθος	131v	Ει και λιθος	137v
πλ β	Επι ξυλου	196	Η παρθενος	137		
βαρυς	Τον εκ πατρος	198v	Τον εκ πατρος	142v	Τον εκ πατρος	140v
πλ δ	Μη θρηνοις	201	Νυμφην σε	148	Μη θρηνοις	142v

(6) For a more detailed account of these Theotokia, with musical examples and bibliographical footnotes, see my "Tropus and Troparion," *Festgabe für Heinrich Husmann* (München, 1970), p. 308-311.

(7) The Theotokion for the ἦχος βαρύς, or "low" mode, is without the usual refrain.

to the second authentic mode, these twelve Theotokia are largely "bimodal" (8), ending in the mode of their refrain without regard to the mode in which they began. And quite apart from their bearing on the phenomenon of "bimodality", they allow us to infer that in former times the second authentic was the mode in which the Gloria in excelsis was usually sung.

In effect, the Theotokia of the Oktoechos, as listed in our table, continue a series of similar pieces, similarly designed to prepare the singing of the Gloria and assigned in Vatopedi 1488 and its two Chartres concordances to the principal feasts of the Triodion itself (9). Two of them are in fact mere repetitions of pieces already entered within this earlier series (10). Here the refrain is usually the familiar authentic one, less often a plagal refrain borrowed from another Christmas sticheron which begins and ends with the words Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ. And here, once again, we have an indication of the relative independence of our manuscript, for although in the two Laura Triodia the Theotokion for Mid-Pentecost has the authentic refrain, in Vatopedi 1488 it has the plagal.

While the proper "Gloria tropes" of the Triodion are all of them original compositions, those of the Oktoechos, evidently added later, are in some cases mere adaptations of existing pieces. Thus Παρεστῶσα, Τὴν τριήμερον, and Ἡ παρθένος derive from conventional Staurotheotokia by the Emperor Leo; Ἐπὶ ξύλου, on the other hand, adapts an idiomelon from the Good Friday office (Coislin notation on folio 110), adding the familiar refrain and modifying the original opening to change the mode from authentic to plagal. None of these pieces remained long in favor, it appears; in Laura Γ. 72 the original "Gloria trope" for the Ascension has been erased to make room for a conventional prosomoion in Coislin

---

(8) For the concept "bimodal," see Heinrich Husmann, "Modulation und Transposition in den bi- und trimodalen Stichera," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, XXVII (1970), 1-22.

(9) Appendix A, No. 20, 83, 85, 90, 97, 99, 103, and 112.

(10) Laura Γ. 67 first enters Εἰ καὶ λίθος βαρύς under Holy Saturday (folio 67 verso), Σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις under the Sunday of the Women at the Tomb (Chartres fragment, folio 62 verso).

notation (11), and aside from the Oktoechos of Sinai 1243, only Σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις recurs sporadically in later sources (12).

Beyond the Anabathmoi and the several cycles of stichera commemorating the Resurrection, as sung at the Saturday Vespers and on Sundays, complete texts of the Oktoechos also provide a number of further cycles for week-days. The Sticherarion, on the other hand, ignores these ferial provisions, suggesting only too plainly that the week-day offices, in so far as they were drawn from the Oktoechos, were never sung, even in relatively early times, but simply read or recited. Thus the melodies of the Martyrika, Katanyktika, Staurosima, Apostolika, and Nekrosima belong to what might be called "the unwritten part of the repertory," and it is only by way of exception, when such pieces have other uses and more important ones, or when they serve as models for written-out contrafacta, that their music can sometimes be recovered.

Here we are concerned only with the Stichera Nekrosima. Within the Oktoechos the pieces of this cycle are assigned to the regular commemoration of the departed that takes place each week at the Friday Vespers and Saturday Orthros. But within the Triodion-Pentekostarion they are specifically assigned to the solemn commemorations of the departed that usher in the Carnival and the feast of Pentecost. For the melodies of these pieces our two copies of the Chartres Oktoechos are the earliest sources. Following the Anabathmoi, and with a heading describing them as Stichera Nekrosima to be sung at the Friday Vespers preceding the Carnival and the feast of Pentecost, Vatopedi 1488 enters five such pieces—the model stanza Ἄλγος τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἐχρημάτισεν with four apocryphal contrafacta, the last of these a Theotokion. Later, as an afterthought, the scribe has added at the very end of the manuscript Ἐπειδὴ πάντες, another piece of the same kind, assigning it to the Saturday preceding the Carnival. Laura Γ. 67 is more generous, with twelve Nekrosima (or Anapausima, as it prefers to call them), at least one for each mode, plus the contrafactum Σῴζου

---

(11) Σήμερον ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς οὐρανούς; that this Coislin entry in Γ. 72 and the three stichera in Coislin notation at the end of Γ. 74 have been added by the same hand lends further support to the view that these two manuscripts form parts of a single whole.

(12) For example in Iviron 947, a manuscript of the fifteenth century.

μάταιε βίε (13), modeled on an idiomelon from the office for the feast of the Forty Martyrs. Here the entire cycle is ascribed to Joannes Monachos, and while its use is not specified, there can be little doubt that the intention is the same as in the Vatopedi copy.

Not only is the Chartres Oktoechos our earliest source for these melodies, it is also our only early source, for it is not until the fourteenth century that we meet them again—in the Triodion Laura I. 84, where they are entered in place preceding the Carnival, and in the Sticherarion Ambrosiana gr. 44, dated 1342, where they are entered at the end of the manuscript, after other additions, and assigned to the funeral office for monks. Once again, as with the Theotokia of the Passion Antiphons, we can control the versions of these later sources and recognize them as at least distantly related. In a similar way the melody given by Laura Γ. 67 for Ἀμέτρητος ὑπάρχει (14) can be used to control the versions conserved by Joseph Studites, who has used this Nekrosimon as the model for two of his Lenten prosomoia, found with musical notation in most Coislin and Middle Byzantine Sticheraria (15). These versions too are reasonably close to the earlier tradition.

Vatopedi 1488 adds one further supplement—a selection from the Lenten prosomoia of Joseph's brother Theodore—and in so doing emerges as our one Chartres source for the pieces of this important series. Strangely enough, it ignores Joseph's contrafacta altogether, and of those belonging to the companion series by Theodore it contains only twelve of the twenty-nine regularly found in Coislin and Middle Byzantine Sticheraria. The heading characterizes these stichera as δύσληπτα—"difficult to grasp"—and in so far as all twenty-nine are modeled on melodies that a Byzantine singer can scarcely have been expected to sing from memory, the characterization fits, although no one of the twenty-nine can very well have been considered more—or less—"difficult to grasp" than the rest. What impelled our scribe to confine himself to a selection we cannot know, nor can we know what principles governed his choice. The stichera Theodore designed for the Sunday Vespers are all of them omitted. Beyond this, one can discern no sign of system.

---

(13) Folios 156 to 158 verso.
(14) Folio 158.
(15) *Transcripta*, V, 25-27.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

On the following even-numbered pages one will find a list of the apocrypha with their folio numbers in Vatopedi 1488, on the odd-numbered pages opposite, a table locating their concordances in the early sources that have proved most productive. Folio numbers in italics indicate the absence of musical notation. When a folio number is preceded by an asterisk, the source in question contains an ascription to the poet named in the column to the extreme right. Thus, for example, Apocrypha 4 and 7 are ascribed to the Emperor Leo in Sinai 1241, but not in Vatopedi 1488 or in any of my other sources; Apocrypha 46 and 47 are ascribed to John both in Vatopedi 1488 and in Laura Γ. 72. Folio numbers under Laura Γ. 67 for Apocrypha 85 (62 verso, but not 115 verso) to 93 refer, not to this MS itself, but to the folios detached from it formerly preserved at Chartres in the Bibliothèque municipale; for the foliation of this fragment (MS 1754, folios 61–66 verso) see *Studies in Eastern Chant*, I (1966), 97–98.

						Laura Γ. 67	Laura Γ. 72	Patmos 218	Berlin fol. 49	Sinai 1241	Chilandari 307	Author		
1	α	εις το υψος	Chartres	Publican & Pharisee	1			119v						1
2	πλ α	τω πληθει των ανομιων	Chartres	Publican & Pharisee	1v			119v						2
3	πλ β	ασωτου δικην του γυμνωθεντος	Chartres	Prodigal Son	3v									3
4	πλ δ	ο εν βρωτοις	Coislin	Expulsion	15v			119 bis	97	*6		Leo		4
5	πλ α	της ψυχοφθορου απατης	Chartres	Theodore	20v			119 bisv	100v					5
6	πλ β	εν ασμασι χαρμονικοις	Chartres	Theodore	21				101					6
7	πλ δ	του φρενοβλαβους ανακτος	Coislin	Theodore	21v					*22		Leo		7
8	β	παθεσι τοις πονηροις	Chartres	Second Saturday	30v			135v	104					8
9	πλ β	εθου με μανδραν	Chartres	Third Saturday	35			136	106					9
10	α	εδει τον της νηστειας	Chartres	Third Saturday	36			*136*						10
11	α	εν πευκη και κεδρω ... τον λαον σου	Chartres	Third Saturday	36v								Theotokion, not identical with the »Staurotheotokion« by Leo	11
12	πλ β	σημερον το σκηπτρον	Coislin	Third Saturday	36v			*136*v	106v				Marginal	12
13	δ	της οικονομιας σου	Chartres	Adoration	39									13
14	πλ β	ιδου το προφητικον	Chartres	Adoration	39v	3				42			Theotokion	14
15	πλ β	χαιροις σταυρε βασιλεων	Chartres	Adoration	40	3v		115						15
16	πλ δ	τον αρνα παλαι	Chartres	Adoration	40	68		163		*121		Leo	Staurotheotokion	16
17	πλ β	κυριε ον ανυμνουσιν	Chartres	Fourth Saturday	44	6		*137*	110					17
18	πλ α	κυριε η ειρηνη	Chartres	Fifth Saturday	48v	10		*137*v						18
19	πλ β	την ψυχωφελη πληρωσαντες τεσσαρακοστην ιωμεν	Coislin	Sixth Friday	54v	15v		*138*	117	63				19
20	β	τυπος της ανθρωπινης	Chartres	Lazarus	57v	17v		*138*					Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	20
21	δ	ο εν κολποις	Chartres	Palm Sunday	61	18v								21
22	δ	την του λαζαρου εγερσιν	Chartres	Palm Sunday	62	19v							Sinai 1242, *f. 59*	22
23	πλ β	ο πολον κτισας ουρανων	Chartres	Palm Sunday	*63v	21					2	John	Model: Ὁ ἔχων θρόνον	23
24	πλ β	τον επι θρονου χερουβιμ	Chartres	Palm Sunday	*64	21					2v	As above	As above	24
25	πλ β	ω πονηρα συναγωγη	Chartres	Palm Sunday	*64	21						As above	As above	25
26	πλ β	ω συναγωγη πονηρα	Chartres	Palm Sunday	64v	21	1						Theotokion	26
27	πλ δ	δευτε και ημεις	Chartres	Palm Sunday	66	23					8v		Model: Ἦλθεν ὁ σωτήρ	27
28	πλ δ	ο αναρχος υιος	Chartres	Palm Sunday	66	23v							Theotokion	28
29	πλ α	φθασαντες πιστοι τα ζωηρρυτα παθη	Chartres	Monday	67v	25v	*2					Andrew	Model: Φθάσαντες πιστοὶ τὸ σωτήριον πάθος	29
30	πλ α	φθασαντες πιστοι το εκουσιον παθος	Chartres	Monday	67v	25v	*2					As above	As above	30
31	πλ α	κυριε ο λαος ον εξηγαγες	Chartres	Monday	68	26								31

						Laura Γ. 67	Laura Γ. 72	Patmos 218	Berlin fol. 49	Sinai 1241	Chilandari 307	Author		
32	β	των παθων του κυριου	Chartres	Monday	68v	24v	2v							32
33	πλ α	κυριε την εις σε προειδως	Chartres	Monday	70	25	3	*126v		*54v		Text by Leo	Chartres and Coislin melodies independent	33
34	δ	του μυλωνος πεισατω σε	Chartres	Tuesday	*71	29						Andrew	Model: Τοῦ κρύψαντος	34
35	δ	τας δεκα παρθενευουσας	Chartres	Tuesday	*71v	29v						As above	As above	35
36	δ	αποβαλλου το ραθυμον	Chartres	Tuesday	*71v							As above	As above; Vienna theol. gr. 136, f. 206v	36
37	β	τοις δεξιοις με προβατοις	Chartres	Tuesday	72	28v							Model: Ὁ τῇ ψυχῆς	37
38	β	οταν ελθης εν δοξη μετ' αγγελων δυναμεων οικτιρμον	Chartres	Tuesday	72v	29							As above	38
39	β	νυμφιε φιλοψυχε	Chartres	Tuesday	74	28	5					Leo	*Sinai 1242, f. 141	39
40	πλ β	χριστοκτονων δημος	Chartres	Wednesday	74v								Model: Ἤπλωσεν ἡ πόρνη	40
41	πλ β	ουρανον εχων ως θρονον	Chartres	Wednesday	74v								As above	41
42	πλ β	σοι τω μυρω μυρων	Chartres	Wednesday	75								As above	42
43	πλ β	αρχιερεις και γραμματεις	Chartres	Wednesday	75	55v				99v				43
44	πλ β	εν τη αυλη του καιαφα	Chartres	Wednesday	75v									44
45	πλ β	σημερον το πονηρον συνηχθη συνεδριον	Chartres	Wednesday	75v									45
46	πλ β	η βεβυθισμενη τη αμαρτια	Coislin	Wednesday	*77v	33v	*8				18	John	Model: Ἡ ἀπεγνωσμένη	46
47	πλ β	η εσκοτισμενη τη διανοια	Coislin	Wednesday	*78	33v	*8				18v	As above	As above	47
48	πλ β	σημερον η μισοχριστος συναγωγη	Chartres	Wednesday	78	34	8v							48
49	πλ β	σημερον προδιδωσι τοις παρανομοις	Chartres	Maundy Thursday	79	34v = 159v								49
50	πλ β	ω της αφατου σου	Chartres	Maundy Thursday	79v	34v								50
51	πλ β	η φθονοτοκος συναγωγη	Chartres	Maundy Thursday	79v	32	7							51
52	πλ β	ιουδας ο δουλος και δολιος ο φιλος	Chartres	Maundy Thursday	80v	35v	10						Theotokion	52
53	β	ιουδαν τον δολιον	Chartres	Maundy Thursday	83v	38	11v							53
54	β	επι το παθος το εκουσιον	Chartres	Pedilavium	84v	38v	12							54
55	β	εν τω νιπτηρι προσπιστουμενος	Chartres	Pedilavium	85	38v	12						Model: Ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος	55
56	β	μετα το βαπτισμα της αφθαρσιας	Chartres	Pedilavium	85	38v	12						As above	56
57	β	ο νιψας τους ποδας	Chartres	Pedilavium	85	39v	13				26			57
58	β	ο δειξας τω πετρω	Chartres	Pedilavium	85v						26		Model: Ὁ νίψας τοὺς πόδας	58
59	β	ο σωσας το στιφος	Chartres	Pedilavium	85v						26		As above	59
60	α	αρξαμενος απο των εσχατων	Chartres	Pedilavium	87v	40	14							60
61	πλ δ	φυσεως τους ορους	Chartres	Holy Sufferings	101	47	21	133v	132		38		Theotokion; Model: Τρίτον ἀρνησάμενος	61
62	α	αμπελος αληθινη	Chartres	Good Friday	107v	54v	29			*94v*				62
63	πλ β	η παρθενος και μητηρ ορωσα σε	Chartres	Good Friday	108	3	29	162		*115		Leo	Staurotheotokion	63
64	δ	λαος δυσσεβης και παρανομος ινα τι με εγκατελιπες	Chartres	Good Friday	108v									64
65	πλ α	εξεστη κτισις απασα	Chartres	Good Friday	109	57	30			98v			Staurotheotokion	65
66	πλ β	σημερον ο δοξη τη πατρικη	Chartres	Good Friday	121	*62v	34v	*127		*101v		Leo		66
67	πλ δ	η ανυμφος μητηρ οτε μετα νεκρων	Chartres	Good Friday	121v	65	37v			148v	55v		Theotokion	67
68	πλ δ	σημερον ο τους απ' αιωνος νεκρους	Chartres	Holy Saturday	124v	70v	40v							68

69	πλ δ	ορωσα σε η παναμωμος μητηρ	Chartres	Holy Saturday	125
70	α	σημερον σωτηρια τω κοσμω	Coislin	Easter Sunday	*125v
71	α	αναστασεως ημερα καρποφορησωμεν	Coislin	Easter Sunday	*126
72	α	το μακαριον πασχα και υπερκοσμιον	Coislin	Easter Sunday	*126v
73	πλ α	πασχα εορτων εορτη	Chartres	Easter Week	127v
74	πλ α	πασχα των ψυχων	Chartres	Easter Week	128
75	πλ α	πασχα χαρμοσυνης υμιν	Chartres	Easter Week	128
76	πλ α	ευφραινεσθωσαν οι ουρανοι	Chartres	Easter Week	129
77	πλ α	αγγελοι σκιρτησατε	Chartres	Easter Week	129
78	πλ α	ω φυλακες ιουδαιων	Chartres	Easter Week	129v
79	πλ α	ονπερ το πριν η παρθενος	Chartres	Easter Week	129v
80	β	ο εξ αφθονου πηγης	Chartres	Antipascha	131
81	β	ω των παραδοξων σου θαυματων	Chartres	Antipascha	131v
82	πλ α	ω της αφατου σου αγαθοτητος	Chartres	Antipascha	131v
83	πλ β	ο θωμας τη ψηλαφησει	Chartres	Antipascha	133
84	α	της λαμπρας και ενδοξου	Chartres	Women at the Tomb	135v
85	β	συν ταις αλλαις	Chartres	Women at the Tomb	137
86	δ	το φαιδρον κηρυγμα	Chartres	Women at the Tomb	138
87	πλ β	των μυροφορων την πολλην αθυμιαν	Chartres	Women at the Tomb	138v
88	πλ β	η ασπιλος και παναμωμος	Chartres	Women at the Tomb	138v
89	πλ β	ανηλθες ο ακαταληπτος	Chartres	Paralytic	140v
90	πλ β	κυριε ο θεος μου ο ιασαμενος	Chartres	Paralytic	141
91	πλ δ	φωνης κυριου ακουτισθωμεν	Chartres	Mid-Pentecost	144
92	πλ β	αδελφοι αγαπητοι ταδε λεγει	Chartres	Mid-Pentecost	144v
93	πλ β	προ του αχραντου σου σταυρου	Chartres	Mid-Pentecost	144v
94	δ	παρεστιν η μεσοτης ημερων	None	Mid-Pentecost	*145*
95	δ	ηκουσε και ευφρανθη η σιων	None	Mid-Pentecost	*145*
96	δ	ηγγικεν η του θειου δαψιλης	None	Mid-Pentecost	*145*
97	πλ β	το υδωρ το ζων	Chartres	Mid-Pentecost	145
98	β	χριστε βασιλευς	Chartres	Woman of Samaria	147v
99	β	το αντλημα και το φρεαρ	Chartres	Woman of Samaria	147v
100	δ	η πηγη της αφθαρσιας	Chartres	Woman of Samaria	148
101	πλ β	χριστος ο θεος ο παρθενικην	Chartres	Woman of Samaria	148
102	πλ α	ο του τυφλου εκ γενετης	Chartres	Man Born Blind	151
103	α	επι το ορος των ελαιων	Chartres	Ascension	156v
104	πλ α	ανεληφθης χριστε μη χωρισθεις	Chartres	Ascension	156v
105	πλ α	του φθαρεντος αδαμ	Chartres	Ascension	157
106	πλ β	το της οικονομιας μυστηριον	Chartres	Ascension	157
107	πλ β	ο προ των αιωνων θεος	Chartres	Ascension	161v

Laura Γ. 67	Laura Γ. 72	Patmos 218	Berlin fol. 49	Sinai 1241	Chilandari 307	Author		
70v	41			*120v		Leo	Staurotheotokion	69
*71v	*42	*203v	141	149v	69	John		70
*71v	*42		141	150	69v	As above		71
*72	*42v					As above		72
73v	52					Constantine	*Ochrida 53, p. 657	73
73v	49v			150v				74
74	53v							75
......								76
74	54	120	142	151	72A	Leo	*Ochrida 53, p. 657	77
74v	57v	*139*	142					78
73	47v						Theotokion	79
76v	60v							80
77	61							81
80	64v							82
78	62v						Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	83
*72 =81v	*42v	203v	141			John		84
62v =115v							Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	85
61v	49v							86
62	68v							87
62	69	162v		*115		Leo	Staurotheotokion	88
64	70v							89
64v	71						Model: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	90
66	75v							91
66	74							92
66v	74							93
......	73						Model: Κύριε ἀνελθών	94
......	73						As above	95
......	73						As above	96
82	73v						Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	97
84	76				91v			98
84	76						Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	99
84v	76							100
85v				171v	91v		Theotokion	101
87v	77v							102
91v	82						Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	103
92v	83							104
93							Model: 'Ανελήφθης Χριστέ	105
95	83v				103v			106
90v	81 =89v						Theotokion	107

108	πλ β	εν νεφελη αρθεις	Chartres	Ascension	162
109	δ	τους αγραμματους μαθητας	Chartres	Pentecost	*165
110	δ	γλωσσαις πυριναις απλανως	Chartres	Pentecost	*165v
111	δ	πεντηκοστην οι γηγενεις	Chartres	Pentecost	*165v
112	πλ β	της τελευταιας εορτης	Chartres	Pentecost	165v
113	πλ β	ο παρακλητος ωσπερ εφης	Chartres	Pentecost	167
114	πλ β	ηλιε αδυτε παρακλητε	Chartres	Pentecost	170v
115	βαρυς	την ενδοξον του πνευματος	None	Pentecost	*171*
116	βαρυς	η καθοδος του πνευματος	None	Pentecost	*171*
117	πλ α	συναναρχε ομοουσιε	Chartres	Pentecost	172
118	πλ β	ελαμψεν η χαρις σου τοις θειοις	Chartres	Pentecost	172
119	α	παρεστωσα τω σταυρω σου	Chartres	Oktoechos	181
120	β	ωσπερ της παρθενιας	Chartres	Oktoechos	184
121	γ	παρθενικην ωσπερ μητραν	Chartres	Oktoechos	186v
122	δ	τι σου το ξενον υιε μου	Chartres	Oktoechos	189v
123	πλ α	ει και λιθος βαρυς	Chartres	Oktoechos	193
124	πλ β	επι ξυλου βλεπουσα	Chartres	Oktoechos	196
125	βαρυς	υπερεβης παρθενε	Chartres	Oktoechos	197v
126	βαρυς	τον εκ πατρος εωσφορον	Chartres	Oktoechos	198v
127	πλ δ	μη θρηνοις εμποιεισθαι σοι	Chartres	Oktoechos	201
128	πλ β	λογος του θεου ενυποστατος	Chartres	Friday before the Carnival	212v
129	πλ β	γενος των ανθρωπων υμνησωμεν	Chartres	Friday before the Carnival	213
130	πλ β	οντως ματαιοτης τα συμπαντα	Chartres	Friday before the Carnival	213
131	πλ β	συ ει η πηγη της ζωης ημων	Chartres	Friday before the Carnival	213v

Laura Γ. 67	Laura Γ. 72	Patmos 218	Berlin fol. 49	Sinai 1241	Chilandari 307	Author		
93v	83v							108
.....						Cosmas		109
.....						As above	Model: Τοὺς ἀγραμμάτους μαθητάς	110
.....						As above	As above	111
98	89						Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	112
99	88	*139*v						113
96v								114
.....							Model: Παράκλητον ἔχοντες	115
.....							As above	116
100v							Triadikon	117
.....								118
.....							Sinai 1243, f. 130; Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	119
.....							Refrain as above	120
120v							Sinai 1243, f. 134; Refrain as above	121
126		162					Sinai 1243, f. 135; Refrain as above	122
131v =69v							Sinai 1243, f. 137v; Refrain as above	123
.....							Refrain as above	124
*140v						John	Theotokion	125
142v							Sinai 1243, f. 140v	126
.....							Sinai 1243, f. 142v; Refrain: Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις	127
.....							Nekrosimon; Model: ῎Αλγος τῷ ἀδάμ	128
.....							As above	129
.....							As above	130
.....							Theotokion; Model as above	131

APPENDIX B

THE PEDILAVIUM

84v Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τῆς θείας λειτουργίας πρὸ τῆς ὀπισθαμβώνου εὐχῆς γίνεται ὁ νιπτὴρ οὕτως· εἰ μέν ἐστι ὁ ποιῶν τὸν νιπτῆρα ἱερεύς, ποιεῖ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τὸ Κύριε ἐκέκραξα· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι, ποιεῖ αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν λειτουργίαν εἰς τὸν νάρθηκα. Μετὰ τὸ Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν, ἄρχονται ψάλλειν οἱ μοναχοὶ τροπάρια. 5

Ἀντίφωνον α΄

ἦχος β Επι το παθος το εκουσιον . . .

στίχος. Μακάριοι οἱ ἄμωμοι ἐν ὁδῷ.

85 ⟨ἦχος β⟩ Εν τω νιπτηρι προσπιστουμενος . . .

στίχος β΄. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐξερευνῶντες τὰ μαρτύρια. 10

⟨ἦχος β⟩ Μετα το βαπτισμα της αφθαρσιας . . .

Δόξα. Θεοτοκίον. Τὴν πᾶσαν ἐλπίδα μου.

Ἀντίφωνον β΄

ἦχος β Ο νιψας τους ποδας . . .

στίχος. Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν ἐν ταῖς. 15

85v ὅμοιον

⟨ἦχος β⟩ Ο δειξας τω πετρω . . .

στίχος. Σὺ ἐνετείλω τὰς ἐντολάς σου φυλάξασθαι.

ὅμοιον

⟨ἦχος β⟩ Ο σωσας το στιφος . . . 20

Δόξα. Θεοτοκίον. Χαῖρε μαρία θεοτόκε ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἀκατάλυτος.

Ἀντίφωνον γ΄

ᾠδὴ ε΄. τῆς αὐτῆς μεγάλης ε΄. Κοσμᾶ μοναχοῦ.

ἦχος πλ β Τω συνδεσμω της αγαπης . . .

στίχος. Ὄφελον κατευθυνθείησαν αἱ ὁδοί μου. 25

⟨ἦχος πλ β⟩ Η το ασχετον κρατουσα . . .

86 στίχος. Τότε οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ ἐν τῷ με ἐπιβλέπειν.

---

3 Ps. 140 8 Ps. 118,1 10 Ps. 118,2 15 Ps. 118,3 18 Ps. 118,4 25 Ps. 118,5 27 Ps. 118,6

⟨ἦχος πλ β⟩ Μαθηταις υποδεικνυει . . .

Δόξα καὶ νῦν. Θεοτοκίον. Μονογενὲς ὁμοούσιε· τῷ πατρί σου

30 καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

Καὶ εὐθέως ὁ διάκονος ἄρχεται τὴν συναπτὴν οὕτως· Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν, ἕως Καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν χρῃζόντων.

Εἶτα ἐπισυνάπτει οὕτως·

Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο εἰς ἔκπλυσιν τοῦ ῥύπου τῶν

35 πταισμάτων ἡμῶν τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

Ὑπὲρ τοῦ συντριβῆναι τὸν σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν τοῦ 86v κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

Ἀντιλαβοῦ σῶσον ἐλέησον. Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου.

Ἐκφώνησις. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ἡ κάθαρσις καὶ ἁγιασμὸς τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.

40 Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀμὴν εὔχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν εὐχὴν ταύτην·

Εὐχὴ α΄. Κύριε ὑπεράγαθε.

Εὐχὴ β΄. Δέσποτα κύριε τῆς δόξης.

Εἶτα· Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν.

Ὁ διάκονος· Τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ.

45 Εὐχὴ γ΄. Ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν· ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ ἔλεός σου.

Ὁ διάκονος· Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην· Τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πάντα παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, ἐγείρεται ⟨ἐκ⟩ τοῦ δείπνου καὶ τίθησι τὰ ἱμάτια. Καὶ τούτου λεγομένου || ἐκδύεται ὁ 87 50 μέλλων νίψαι εἰ μέν ἐστι πρεσβύτερος τὸ φελώνιον, εἰ δὲ μοναχὸς τὸν μανδύαν αὐτοῦ, εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς τὸ ἱμάτιν. Λέγοντος δὲ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Καὶ λαβὼν λέντιον, ζώννυται καὶ αὐτὸς λέντιον. Λέγοντος δὲ Εἶτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα, βάλλει καὶ αὐτὸς ὕδωρ, καὶ λέγοντος Καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας, ἄρχεται καὶ αὐτὸς νίπτειν, ἀρχό-55 μενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων· καὶ ἐκμάσσει μετὰ τοῦ λεντίου, καὶ τίθησι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ διάκονος λέγει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἕως τὸ Ἤιδει γὰρ τὸν παραδιδόντα αὐτόν. Καὶ εὐθέως ὁ λαός· Δόξα σοι κύριε. Καὶ ἄρχονται ψάλλειν εὐθέως οἱ μοναχοί·

Ἀντίφωνον α΄

60 ἦχος α Ο λεντιω ζωσαμενος . . .

στίχος. Ἐλέησόν με ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου. 87v

47–49 Io. 13,3–4 52 Io. 13,4 52–53 Io. 13,5 54 Io. 13,5 57 Io. 13,11 61 Ps. 50,3

---

51 λέγοντας cod. τὸν εὐαγγέλιον cod.

⟨ἦχος α⟩ Ο λεντιω ζωσαμενος . . .
στίχος β'. Ἐπὶ πλεῖον πλῦνόν με ἀπὸ τῆς.
⟨ἦχος α⟩ Αρξαμενος απο των εσχατων . . .
Δόξα καὶ νῦν. ⟨Θεοτοκίον⟩. Χαῖρε θεοτόκε παρθένε ὅτι ἔτεκες τὸν 65
βασιλέα τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ φωστῆρα πάντων.
88 Καὶ εὐθέως εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην· Τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, ὅτε ἔνιψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς πόδας. Τέλος· Μακάριοι ἐστὲ ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά.
Ὁ λαός· Δόξα σοι Κύριε.
Καὶ εὐθέως ἄρχονται ψάλλειν τροπάρια· 70
ᾠδὴ ς'. τῆς μεγάλης ε', πρὸς τό· Ἄβυσσος ἐσχάτη.
⟨ἦχος πλ β⟩ Κυριον φωνειτε ω μαθηται . . .
στίχος. Ῥαντιεῖς με ὑσσώπῳ.
Καὶ τούτου ψαλλομένου, αἴρουσιν εἰς ὕψος οἱ μοναχοὶ τὸν νιπτῆρα καὶ ῥαντίζουσι τὸν λαὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ εἰσέρχονται ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ 75 ψάλλοντες τροπάρια·
ᾠδὴ ε', πρός· Πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω.
ἦχος πλ β Ρυφθεντες ποδας . . .
88v Δόξα καὶ νῦν. Θεοτοκίον. Μεγάλων χαρισμάτων ἁγνὴ παρθένε.
Καὶ εὐθέως γίνεται ἡ ὀπισθάμβωνος εὐχή· καὶ δίδει τὸ ἀντίδωρον 80 καὶ γίνεται ἡ ἀπόλυσις.
Ἕτερα στιχηρὰ εἰς τὸν Νιπτῆρα
ἦχος β Μεγαλης ευεργεσιας απολαυειν . . .
89 ἦχος β Ο πετρος ηυλαβειτο . . .
89v ἄλλο 85
ἦχος πλ δ Σημερον ο απροσιτος τη ουσια εργον δουλου . . .

τέλος τῆς μεγάλης ε'

---

63 Ps. 50,4 67–68 Io. 13,12–17 73 Ps. 50,9

73 μοι cod.

APPENDIX C

THE GONYKLISIA

Τῇ ἁγίᾳ κυριακῇ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἑσπέρας ἰστέον ὅτι οὕτως 166 τελεῖται ἡ γονυκλισία καὶ ἡ τάξις τοῦ ἑσπερινοῦ. Ψάλλομεν τὸ Εὐλόγει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον καὶ τὸ Κύριε ἐκέκραξα εἰς ἦχον δ καὶ ψάλλομεν στιχηρὰ Κοσμᾶ μοναχοῦ.
5 ἦχος δ Παραδοξα σημερον . . .
ἦχος δ Το πνευμα το αγιον ην . . . 166v
[ἦχος δ] Το πνευμα το αγιον φως . . . 167
εἰς τὸ Δόξα
ἦχος πλ β Ο παρακλητος ωσπερ εφης . . .
10 Καὶ εὐθέως γίνεται ἡ εἴσοδος καθὼς καὶ πάντοτε. Καὶ λέγει ὁ 167v διάκονος· Πρόσχωμεν. Ὁ ἱερεύς· Εἰρήνη πᾶσι. Γίνεται ἡ καθέδρα. Ὁ διάκονος· Σοφία. Καὶ εὐθέως τὸ προκείμενον· ἦχος βαρύς· Τίς θεὸς μέγας. στίχος· Ἐγνώρισας ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς. Καὶ ἀπὸ τὸ προκείμενον λέγει ὁ διάκονος πάραυτα· Εἴπωμεν πάντες. Καὶ μετὰ τὴν συναπτὴν 15 γίνεται ἡ ἐκτενὴ καθὼς καὶ πάντοτε. Καὶ λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφώνως· Ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπος. Καὶ ὁ διάκονος· Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα. Καὶ κλινάντων πάντων ἄρχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν εὐχὴν ταύτην· εὐχὴ α'· Ἄχραντε ἀμίαντε ἄναρχε. Λέγει δὲ ταύτην ὁ ἱερεὺς οὔτε πολὺ μικρᾷ οὔτε πάσῃ ἐκφωνήσει τρανῶς, ἀλλὰ μεσαίᾳ 20 φωνῇ. Τελεσθείσης || δὲ τῆς α' εὐχῆς λέγει ὁ διάκονος· Ἀντιλαβοῦ 168 σῶσον ἐλέησον ἀνάστησον καὶ διαφύλαξον. Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου. Ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἐκφώνησιν τῆς εὐχῆς ἣν εἶπεν. Ὁ λαός·ἀμήν. Καὶ εὐθέως ψάλλεται ἀντίφωνον α' ⟨ἦχος β⟩ Ἠγάπησα ὅτι εἰσακούσεται κύριος. Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς θεοτόκου. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τρεῖς στίχους, 25 Δόξα. Λέγει καὶ εὐθέως ὁ διάκονος· Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα.

---

3 Ps. 103,1 Ps. 140,1 12–13 Ps. 76,14 13 Ps. 76,15 23 Ps. 114,1

19 ἐκφωνῇ cod. 20 γέγ(ει) cod. 22 ἣν] εἰς cod. 23 ψάλελλεται cod. 24 ἤπην cod.

Καὶ ἄρχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν β´ εὐχὴν οὕτως· Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τὴν
σὴν εἰρήνην δεδωκώς. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι ταύτην λέγει ὁ διάκονος·
Ἀντιλαβοῦ. Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου. Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἐκφώνησιν.
Καὶ εὐθέως ἄρχεται ἀντίφωνον β´ ἦχος β· Ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα.
Σῶσον ἡμᾶς παράκλητε ἀγαθὲ ψάλλοντας. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν γ´ 30
στίχους δοξάζει καὶ λέγει· Ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς καὶ λόγος, εἰς ἦχον
168v πλ β. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ λέγει ‖ θεοτοκίον

πλ β Τὴν ὑπερένδοξον τοῦ χριστοῦ μητέρα . . .

Καὶ μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι τὸ θεοτοκίον λέγει ὁ διάκονος· Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι
κλίναντες τὰ γόνατα. Καὶ ἄρχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν γ´ εὐχὴν οὕτως· 35
Ἡ ἀεννάως βρύουσα ζωτική. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι ταύτην λέγει
ὁ διάκονος· Ἀντιλαβοῦ. Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου. Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν
ἐκφώνησιν. Καὶ εὐθέως ψάλλεται ἀντίφωνον τρίτον εἰς ἦχον πλ δ·
Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Εὐλογητὸς εἶ χριστὲ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.
Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν γ´ στίχους δοξάζει καὶ λέγει πάλιν· Εὐλογητὸς 40
169 εἶ χριστὲ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. ‖ Καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεί. Καὶ ψάλλει τὸ κοντάκιον,
καὶ εὐθέως τὸ Καταξίωσον κύριε τὴν ἑσπέραν. Καὶ λέγει ὁ διάκονος·
Πληρώσωμεν τὴν ἑσπερινὴν δέησιν. Τοῦ δὲ διακόνου λέγοντος τὴν
συναπτὴν καὶ τὰς αἰτήσεις, λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν δ´ εὐχὴν καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτῆς
λέγει καὶ τῆς ἀπολύσεως. Τοῦ δὲ διακόνου πληρώσαντος τὴν συνα- 45
πτὴν καὶ εἰπόντος Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου, ἐκφωνεῖ ὁ ἱερεύς· Ὅτι
ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος. Εἰρήνη πᾶσι. Ὁ διάκονος· Τὰς κεφαλὰς
ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ κλίνατε. Καὶ εἰπόντος τοῦ ἱερέως τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς
κεφαλοκλισίας ἐκφωνεῖ πάλιν οὕτως· Εἴη τὸ κράτος τῆς βασιλείας
σου. Καὶ εὐθέως ψάλλονται τὰ στιχηρὰ τοῦ στίχου. 50

ἦχος γ Νυν εις σημειον . . .

169v ὅμοιον

⟨ἦχος γ⟩ Νυν το παρακλητον . . .

170 ὅμοιον

⟨ἦχος γ⟩ Νυν περιβαλλονται κρατος . . .

170v εἰς τὸ Δόξα 55

[ἦχος πλ β] Ηλιε αδυτε παρακλητε . . .

Καὶ εὐθέως· Νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου. Καὶ γίνεται ἡ ἀπόλυσις
κατὰ τάξιν. Καὶ πληρώνεται ἡ ἀκολουθία τῆς γονυκλισίας.

---

29 Ps. 115,1 39 Ps. 116,1 58 Lu. 2,29

---

46 ἰκφώ cod.

INDICES

ANALYTICAL INDEX

INDEX OF FIRST LINES

Folio numbers in italics indicate the absence of musical notation. Asterisks mark those entries for which the scribe has used the Chartres notation. In classifying those texts for which the scribe has (or might have) used the designation "troparion" we have been guided chiefly by liturgical considerations. Troparia that are treated exactly as though they were stichera we have entered under *Stichera and Troparia*. Here, for example, one will find the troparia of the several antiphons—those of the office of the Holy Sufferings, of the Good Friday Hours, of the Anabathmoi. Troparia whose function is essentially responsorial we have entered under *Troparia and Kathismata*. Here one will find the troparia associated with lessons—the opening troparion of the office of the Holy Passions (folio 90) and the troparion of the Good Friday Tierce-Sext (folio 116 verso)—also, since like the last it represents a borrowing from the Constantinopolitan order, the troparion of Pentecost as a part of the Gonyklisia.

STICHERA AND TROPARIA

---

(1) cod. την πλευραν.

(1) cod. γλωσσαις.

(1) cod. οδευσωμεν.

(1) cod. ευξ.

(1) cod. πλ β, Laur. Γ. 67 and Γ. 72 πλ α.

TROPARIA AND KATHISMATA

HEIRMOI AND STANZAS OF CANONS AND TRIODIA

πλ β

MAKARISMOI

KONTAKION AND OIKOS

EXAPOSTEILARION

Vol. 8. HIRMOLOGIUM SABBAITICUM
ED. JØRGEN RAASTED
Copenhague 1968-70
(reproduction intégrale du Cod. Saba 83)
1. Pars Suppletoria. (broché) et
2.1. Pars Prima: Toni Authentici (relié)
Prix: cour. dan. 1897.50
2.2. Pars Secunda: Toni Plagales (relié)
Prix: cour. dan. 1328.25

Vol. 9. TRIODIUM ATHOUM
ED. ENRICA FOLLIERI et OLIVER STRUNK
(reproduction intégrale du Codex Monasterii Vatopediou 1488). – Copenhague 1975.
Pars Principalis et Pars Suppletoria.
Prix: br. cour. dan. 2242.50
Relié demi chevreau cour. dan. 2415.–

Série Subsidia. Grand in 8°.

Vol. 1, Fasc. 1. H. J. W. TILLYARD: HANDBOOK OF THE MIDDLE BYZANTINE MUSICAL NOTATION
Second impression Copenhague 1970
Prix: br. cour. dan. 28.75

Vol. 1, Fasc. 2. CARSTEN HØEG: LA NOTATION EKPHONÉTIQUE
Copenhague 1935 – Prix: br. cour. dan. 29.90

Vol. 2. (= American Series, No. 1). EGON WELLESZ: EASTERN ELEMENTS IN WESTERN CHANT. Boston 1947
Réimpression Copenhague 1967 – Prix: relié cour. dan. 185.15

Vol. 3. R. PALIKAROVA VERDEIL. LA MUSIQUE BYZANTINE CHEZ LES BULGARES ET LES RUSSES (en collaboration avec l'Institut Byzantin de Boston). Copenhague 1953 – Prix: br. cour. dan. 65.55

Vol. 4. STUDIES ON THE FRAGMENTA CHILIANDARICA PALAEOSLAVICA. I
Miloš M. VELIMIROVIĆ: BYZANTINE ELEMENTS IN EARLY SLAVIC CHANT: THE HIRMOLOGIUM
Pars Principalis et Pars Suppletoria
(in collaboration with *The Dumbarton Oaks Research Libr. and Coll.* and the *Slavic Department* of Harvard University)
Copenhagen 1960
Les 2 volumes ne sont vendus qu'ensemble. – Prix: br. cour. dan. 86.25

Vol. 5. R. P. BARTOLOMEO DI SALVO:
CANTI ECCLESIASTICI DELLA TRADIZIONE ITALO-ALBANESE. I
CANTI DELLA SICILIA
(sous presse)

Vol. 6. STUDIES ON THE FRAGMENTA CHILIANDARICA PALAEOSLAVICA. II
Ed. ROMAN JAKOBSON:
FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS
OF EARLY SLAVIC MUSIC AND POETRY
(sous presse)

Vol. 7. JØRGEN RAASTED: INTONATION FORMULAS AND MODAL SIGNATURES IN BYZANTINE MUSICAL MANUSCRIPTS. Copenhagen 1966
Prix. br. cour. dan. 55.20

Vol. 8. CHRISTIAN THODBERG: DER BYZANTINISCHE ALLELUIARIONZYKLUS STUDIEN IM KURZEN PSALTIKONSTIL
Kopenhagen 1966 – Prix: br. cour. dan. 82.80

Vol. 9. DIMITRIJE STEFANOVIĆ: THE TRADITION OF THE SLAVIC STICHERARION
(en préparation)

Série Transcripta. Grand in 8°.

Vol. 1. DIE HYMNEN DES STICHERARIUM FÜR SEPTEMBER, übertragen von EGON WELLESZ
Copenhague 1936 – Prix: br. cour. dan. 32.20